

BR
559

CHURCH HISTORY



Published by
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY THOMAS SCOTT, 1856; INCORPORATED BY ACT OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

OFFICERS FOR 1943

H. R. HARTY, JR.	President
WALTER B. WOODWARD	Vice President
WILLIAM C. FRANK	Secretary
WILLIAM B. EMMETT	Treasurer
WALTER B. WOODWARD	Assistant Secretary

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

THOMAS M. MCGEE	EDWARD H. BARTON
WALTER B. WOODWARD	F. F. BUCKLEY
WILLIAM C. FRANK	FRED V. NORWOOD
WILLIAM B. EMMETT	CHAS. C. RICHARDSON
WALTER B. WOODWARD	KENNETH S. LAPOINTE

EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

WALTER B. WOODWARD, Managing Editor
 WALTER B. WOODWARD
 H. R. HARTY, JR., ex officio

PO BOX 100, DEERFIELD, ILLINOIS

WILLIAM B. EMMETT, CHURCH, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Church History is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, and December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price is \$4.00 per annum in advance. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. The subscription price of twenty-five cents a year should be sent to the publisher, Professor Matthew Spinka, 575 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois. Subscriptions should be made to the American Society of Church History.

Contributions, both reviews, and all other material should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 575 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois.

Material for the next issue should be forwarded to the publisher, Professor Matthew Spinka, 575 North Dearborn Street, New York, N. Y.

Published by the American Society of Church History, at the post-office at Deerfield, Illinois.

CHURCH HISTORY

EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS

E. R. HARDY, JR., *ex officio*

Vol. XI

December, 1942

No. 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE LOLLARDS IN PRE-REFORMATION SCOTLAND <i>W. Stanford Reid</i>	269-283
HENRY MELCHIOR MUHLENBERG AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION <i>Theodore G. Tappert</i>	284-301
THE NON-INTRUSION CONTROVERSY IN SCOTLAND, 1832-1843 <i>Arvel B. Erickson</i>	302-325
MINUTES OF THE FIFTY-THIRD MEETING OF THE SOCIETY AND OF THE COUNCIL	326-331

CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEWS:

332

- DOWDELL, VICTOR LYLE, *Aristotle and Anglican Religious Thought* Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.
- CROSBY, SUMNER MCKNIGHT, *The Abbey of St. Denis, 475-1122* Harold R. Willoughby
- WALSH, GERALD GROVELAND, S. J., *Medieval Humanism* R. C. Petry
- THAYER, JAMES ADDISON, *The Christian Approach to the Moslem* Matthew Spinka
- BATTENHOUSE, ROY W., *Marlowe's Tamburlaine: A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy* Quirinus Breen
- JORDAN, W. K., *Men of Substance* Winthrop S. Hudson
- RUSSELL, ELBERT, *A History of Quakerism* Charles A. Hawley
- KIRBY, MRS. E. W., *George Keith, 1638-1716* Niels Henry Sonne
- KLINGBERG, FRANK J., *An Appraisal of the Negro in Colonial South Carolina* Miles Mark Fisher
- WATERMAN, MINA, *Voltaire, Pascal and Human Destiny* Charles H. Lyttle
- BARKER, JOSEPH EDMUND, *Diderot's Treatment of the Christian Religion in the Encyclopedie* Charles H. Lyttle
- CUNNINGHAM, CHARLES E., *Timothy Dwight, 1752-1817: A Biography* William Warren Sweet
- O'CONNOR, JOHN J., *The Catholic Revival in England* J. A. Muller
- ELLIS, JOHN TRACY, *Cardinal Consalvi and Anglo-Papal Relations, 1814-1824* R. Corrigan
- SANDERS, CHARLES RICHARD, *Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement* A. C. Zabriskie
- GLOYN, CYRIL K., *The Church in the Social Order* William Wilson Manross
- SHARPE, DORES ROBINSON, *Walter Rauschenbusch* J. Orin Oliphant
- CURTISS, JOHN S., *An Appraisal of the Protocols of Zion*, Solomon Grayzel

gift
L.G. Vander
3-9-48

THE LOLLARDS IN PRE-REFORMATION SCOTLAND

W. STANFORD REID

McGill University, Montreal, P. Q. Canada

The influence of the Lollard movement on the Scottish Reformation was pointed out by John Knox in the sixteenth century;¹ and in the latter part of the nineteenth century the same point was stressed by the Historiographer Royal for Scotland, P. Hume Brown.² Yet in spite of such illustrious advocacy, with one or two minor exceptions, little attention has been paid to the Wycliffite tradition in fifteenth century Scotland. It has generally been taken for granted that the Lollards were unimportant and possessed little or no influence. When all the information on the movement which we possess, however, is brought together, one cannot but feel that they had a greater influence on their own time than has heretofore been allowed. Not only did the early reformers consider them very important, but today also, in spite of predilections for economic interpretations of history, they must be regarded as one of the important sources of the Scottish Reformation.

One of the major disadvantages under which we labour in the study of Scottish Lollardy, is the absence of any writings which may have been produced by it. Nor do we even have the works which are supposed to have been written against the heretics. It is thus comparatively difficult to estimate their numerical strength, while it is practically impossible to gauge their political and social influence. This is due to the fact that the country was governed, or misgoverned, by the great families, into whose ranks Lollardy apparently never entered. The main propagators of the Wycliffite teachings came from among the university students, and later in the century, from some of the lesser nobility.

That the early dissemination of heretical views in Scotland should have come from university students is not strange. From the year 1357 to 1389 there was a continual stream of

1 John Knox, *The History of the Reformation in Scotland*, D. Laing, ed. (Edinburgh, 1846), I, 1ff (Bannatyne Club) D. L.

2 P. H. Brown, *John Knox* (London, 1895), I, 46.

Scots going south to study at Oxford. As the university was a hot-bed of Lollardy during this period, it is not surprising that the Scots were attracted to the doctrines disliked by the church.³ Many of these students on their return home would become cells of heretical propaganda.

Besides the Scottish scholars, another means by which Lollardy entered the country was undoubtedly Englishmen, themselves. A. F. Steuart has pointed out that the large number of English names which appear in the Scottish church after 1380 may indicate the flight from persecution of English supporters of the Avignon popes.⁴ If this is correct, it is quite possible that English Lollards also fled north, particularly after the enactment of the law *De Haeretico Comburendo*. This would seem to be the case of three priests, James Notyngham, Robert of Roxburgh and John Wythlin who fled across the border about 1400, to escape punishment for holding heretical opinions. They apparently stayed for a time at the Abbey of Kelso, but we have no further information about them.⁵

We do know, however, that in 1407 a certain John Resby, an English priest, was arrested at Perth for teaching Lollard heresies. Since the regent, Robert, Duke of Albany, was strongly opposed to Lollardy, because, according to Tytler, of its communistic views, Laurence of Lindores, the papal inquisitor, was allowed to deal with Resby as he saw fit.⁶ A trial was held during which Resby was accused of believing some forty different heretical doctrines. The most important of these was the denial that the pope was the vicar of Christ, or that he could be unless he was perfectly holy. Having refuted Resby's heretical opinions in typical scholastic fashion, Laurence turned the unrepentant heretic over to the secular arm to be burned.⁷ Some of Resby's writings, according to Bellesheim, were preserved by his followers and read down to the time of the Reformation.⁸

³ *Rotuli Scotiae* (London, 1814), I, 800-II, 83; H. C. Lyte, *History of the University of Oxford* (1886), 308. Most of them probably went to Balliol College with which Wycliffe was connected.

⁴ A. F. Steuart, "Scotland and the Papacy during the Great Schism." *Scottish Historical Review*, IV (1906), 147.

⁵ C. Innes, ed., *Liber S. Marie de Calchou* (Edinburgh, 1846), II, 38 (Bannatyne Club); J. Morton, *Monastic Annals of Teviotdale* (Edinburgh, 1882), 92, 93.

⁶ P. F. Tytler, *The History of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1864), II, 38.

⁷ *Johannis de Fordun, Scotichronicon cum supplemento et continuatione Walteri Boweri* (Edinburgh, 1759), II, 441ff.

⁸ A. Bellesheim, *A History of the Catholic Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1887), II, 55.

Although Laurence of Lindores is a rather sinister figure, his actual ecclesiastical position is somewhat uncertain. By some he is said to have been connected with the monastery of Lindores, and by others with that of Scone. If he held the abbacy of Scone, as it has been asserted, he must have resigned before 1418 when another man was abbot.⁹ That he was a papal inquisitor, however, we do know, since he held that position until his death in 1438. If Thomas Dempster can be believed, he wrote a number of works against the Lollards: "Election and the Power of the Elect," "An Examination of the Heretical Lollards who spread throughout the realm," and "The process of Peter Krek, the English Heresiarch." Professor Baxter of St. Andrews University, however, after much search on the Continent of Europe has been able to discover none of these works. The only writings of Laurence which he found were two commentaries on Aristotle.¹⁰ As these seem never to have gained great fame, Laurence's place in history must rest mainly on his inquisitorial activities.

The execution of Resby did not frighten the Lollards out of Scotland. Instead, they seem to have become increasingly bold. In 1410 a certain Quentin Folkhurde, who seems to have been a small landowner of some sort, in four open letters addressed to the nobility of Scotland and others attacked the Scottish clergy. In the tracts, as in his frequent preachings, he reproved them for their greed and worldliness, at the same time admonishing them to reform their lives, and preach the Gospel in the common tongue. He was particularly bitter against William Lawder, Bishop of Glasgow, which may indicate that he belonged to that prelate's diocese. Since copies of these letters were sent to Prague in 1410 we see that even at this early date there were connections between the Scottish Lollards and the Hussites.¹¹

The founding of the University of St. Andrews seems

9 A. Laing, *Lindores Abbey* (Edinburgh, 1876), 103; Jas. Wilkie, *The Benedictine Monasteries of Northern Fife* (Edinburgh, 1927), 127; J. M. Anderson, "The Beginnings of St. Andrews University," *Scottish Historical Review*, VIII (1911), 237.

10 Thomas Dempster, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Scotorum* (Edinburgh, 1829), II, 443 (Bannatyne Club); J. H. Baxter, "Four 'new' medieval Scottish authors," *Scottish Historical Review*, XXV (1928), 92.

11 J. H. Baxter, ed., *Copiale Prioratus Sanctiandree* (Edinburgh), lx, 230-235; H. B. Workman, *John Wyclif* (Oxford, 1926), I, 10; *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Henry IV*, III (1907), 362.

to be another indication of the influence and fear of the Lollards. According to Fordun's continuator, Walter Bower, the university was started by Henry Wardlaw, Bishop of St. Andrews, somewhat suddenly around 1410. One reason for its establishment was that Scotland still remained faithful to Benedict XIII, the Avignonese pope. Since neither England nor France would recognize Benedict, Scottish students found it difficult to obtain their degrees at the universities of either of these countries. Along with this reason, there was another. In petitioning Benedict XIII to grant his institution university status, Wardlaw pled for a university to counteract the heresy of the times.¹² The appointment of Laurence of Lindores as the rector of the university and as professor of Canon Law gives added evidence of the university's anti-Lollard bias. Perhaps it was due to the influence of Laurence that the congregation of the university took a further step in 1416, decreeing that all Masters of Arts had to take an oath to defend the church against the Lollards and their adherents.¹³ St. Andrews University was to be a bulwark against heresy.

But the university was not the only organization taking notice of the increase of heresy. The growth of Lollardy in Scotland was even brought to the attention of the Council of Constance. Dietrich von Niehms, writing at Constance in 1414, speaks of the Wycliffite doctrines being widely circulated in Bohemia, Moravia, England, and Scotland. In the following year Jean d'Achery, envoy of the University of Paris, preaching before the Pope, called upon him to deal with doctrinal errors "being sown most widely in the kingdoms of Bohemia and Scotland." At the same time, from Peniscola Benedict was calling upon the Bishop of Moray to investigate the heresies being spread abroad in the land.¹⁴ Scotland was beginning to gain something of a reputation.

One reason for the development of Lollardy at this time may have been that the nobles were negotiating with the English Lollards for their aid in releasing James I, the Scottish King, from his English captivity. In 1406 James had been

12 Anderson, "St. Andrews University," 229; J. M. Maitland, "James I and the University of St. Andrews," *Scottish Historical Review*, IV (1906), 313.

13 Anderson, "St. Andrews University," 240; R. K. Hannay, *The Statutes of the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Theology at the Reformation* (St. Andrews, 1910), 8.

14 H. Finke, *Acta Concilia Constanciensis* (Münster, 1923), II, 627, 399; III, 419; *Copiale*, 253.

seized by the English while on his way to France; and in spite of Scottish protests had been kept a prisoner by Henry IV. The same year King Robert III died, leaving the throne to the young captive. As he, however, was in no position to rule, his uncle, Robert, Duke of Albany, was made regent until the Prince's return, which event Albany determined to postpone as long as possible. But other nobles, particularly the Douglasses, with a greater sense of loyalty worked constantly for the King's release. Negotiations with the English King were opened as early as 1408, but without success. Therefore, it seems, some Scots allied themselves with Sir John Oldcastle, the leader of the English Lollards.¹⁵ Since Oldcastle had been stationed at Roxburgh Castle in 1400, he had probably become acquainted with some of the lairds across the border.¹⁶ Therefore it is not surprising that he would be found an ally in an attempt to overthrow the House of Lancaster.

While we have no direct statement that there was such an alliance before 1417, yet certain evidence points to the fact that such a connection existed by 1414. Oldcastle planned to seize Henry in January 1414, and set himself up as regent for Richard II, supposedly living in Scotland. For this purpose the Lollards gathered in St. Giles Field, north of Charing Cross, but were surprised by the royal forces, being either captured or forced to flee. Oldcastle himself escaped to hiding in Hereford.¹⁷ One of his followers, Thomas Payne, a Welshman, was not so fortunate. He escaped from St. Giles Field, but was captured shortly afterwards near Windsor Castle, the prison of the Scottish King. When apprehended, Payne had in his possession both a considerable sum of money and a schedule of all the lodging places between Windsor and Edinburgh. He confessed that he planned to release James and take him north. It would look as though Oldcastle were in league with the Scots to release James if he possibly could, but his expectations came to naught.¹⁸

15 Geo. Burnett, ed., *The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1880), IV, 102; Sir Wm. Fraser, *The Douglas Book* (Edinburgh, 1885), I, 384; *Rot. Scot.*, II, 204.

16 J. Bain, *A Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland in the Public Record Office*, (Edinburgh, 1888), IV, No. 567.

17 C. Oman, *The Political History of England from the Accession of Richard II to the Death of Richard III* (London, 1910), 237.

18 S. Bentley, ed., *Excerpta Historica, or Illustrations of English History* (London, 1833), 144; F. Cleopatra, *British Museum, Cottonian Ms.*, IV, fo. 109.

While the question of a Scottish-Lollard alliance in 1414 is perhaps somewhat problematical, that one existed three years later seems fairly certain. It resulted in a second attempt to release James while Henry V was in France. Although Walsingham is our only source which refers to the Scots connection with the Lollards, there seems to be no reason for rejecting his account. He seems to be corroborated by the events which followed.

After his failure at Charing Cross, Oldcastle was forced to remain in hiding on the Welsh border for some time. Then in 1417 he met William Douglas, Laird of Drumlangrig, at Pomfret. There, arrangements were made for the Scots to attack the borders while Oldcastle endeavoured to raise a rebellion within the country. The Scots were to restore Richard II to his kingdom and in return, no doubt, James would be released. The Douglasses had been working to this end for some time, and it looked as though their purpose would be fulfilled. The attempt, however, failed dismally. The Scots were driven back from their siege of Roxburgh, while Oldcastle's attempted rebellion collapsed. For a time he found safety on the Welsh border, but in less than a year was captured.¹⁹ This was the end of collaboration between English heretics and Scottish nobles. If James was to be released, some other means had to be found.

Yet the period during which Scots nobles and English Lollards were friendly seems to have been a time of respite for the Scottish Lollards. We have no reason to believe that persecution was maintained, in spite of the fact that the heretical movement became more prominent, as shown by the action of St. Andrews University in 1416. It is not likely that the nobles would permit the church to attack the co-religionists of those with whom they were in alliance in England.

The end of the Scottish-Lollard cooperation, however, would leave the church free to take action against heresy. This it seems to have done by the burning of a Lollard in Glasgow, in 1422. Our information about this event is somewhat confused and indefinite. John Knox, our sole authority for it, states that in the "Rolls of the Diocese of Glasgow" it is recorded that an unnamed heretic suffered death for his opinions at

¹⁹ Thomas of Walsingham, *Ypodigma Neustria*, 1876, 482-4 (Rolls Series).

that time. Some feel that Knox has confused this burning with either that of Resby or of Paul Crawar executed at St. Andrews some ten years later. This view, however, does not have much in its favour. Knox mentions the other two burnings at the same time, giving for this particular execution a different place, and citing his sources of information. Thus, although we do not now possess Knox's "Rolls," there seems to be at least some reason for believing that he was not mistaken when he mentioned the burning in Glasgow.²⁰

Coupled with these facts, there are other indications which seem to support Knox's statements. It is reported by both Hector Boece and Thomas Dempster, writing in the sixteenth century, that a certain John Fogo aided in the prosecution of Paul Crawar, for which good work he was granted the abbacy of Melrose. But as Rogers has pointed out, this is impossible, for Fogo was already abbot in 1425, obtaining that position some time after the spring of 1422.²¹ May it not have been that Boece and Dempster got their heretics mixed? Fogo was apparently known to them as one who took part in the prosecution of a heretic, receiving Melrose Abbey as a reward for his labours. Then since Fogo reportedly wrote a book against Crawar, Boece and Dempster may have taken it for granted that Crawar was the heretic who suffered from his attentions, when it may really have been Knox's Lollard of 1422. Although this interpretation is largely conjectural it may be the proper explanation for the statements of Boece and Dempster, and a further corroboration of Knox's account.

When we add to this the fact that the country just south of Glasgow was noted for its heretical ways, it would seem probable that Knox's statements are correct. It also shows that heresy was by this time spreading over to the west coast of Scotland. The Lollard doctrines had begun to touch most of the Lowlands.

The spread of Lollardy was followed, soon after the return of James I to Scotland in 1424, by further repressive measures.

²⁰ Knox, *The Reformation in Scotland*, Wm. M'Gavin, ed. (Edinburgh, 4th ed.), 3; D. Laing, ed., I, 496.

²¹ C. Innes, ed., *Liber S. Marie de Melrose* (Edinburgh, 1837), II, 542 (Bannatyne Club); C. Rogers, ed., *Rental Book of the Cistercian Abbey of Cupar-Angus* (London, 1879), I, 40 (Grampian Club); Hector Boece, *Hystory and Croniklis of Scotland*, J. Bellenden, ed. (Edinburgh, 1519), fo. cexlvii; Dempster, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II, 288.

By the third act of James' first parliament, all bishops were instructed to search throughout their dioceses for Lollards who were to be dealt with according to the laws of the church.²² No doubt the Lancastrian training of the King, as well as the influence of John Fogo, his confessor, were instrumental in having this law put on the statute books. Officially, Lollardy was banished from the realm.

Yet in spite of royal opposition and acts of parliament, Lollardy continued to exist, if not to increase. Sometime during this decade, John Schaw, a monk of Dunfermline, was attending St. Andrews University. Holding heretical views, he had dared to expound them in classes studying the *Sentences*. This caused considerable disturbance with the result that Haldenstone, dean of the Faculty of Theology, forbade the lecturer to allow such discussions on the grounds that they only confused people. There is no evidence, however, that further action was taken.²³

A foreigner guilty of the same indiscretion as Schaw was not let off so lightly. Paul Cwarar, a member of a strongly Hussite Bohemian family, appeared in St. Andrews about 1433. He was a Master of Arts from Paris and a Bachelor of Medicine from Montpellier. He had also studied at Prague, and had been connected for some time with the Polish court. In 1432 he was in Prussia whence he went shortly afterwards to Scotland.²⁴ Whether he went to St. Andrews to study at the university or to evangelize, it is hard to say. The Chronicler Bower says that it was for the latter purpose, and it may well have been so. However, he did not get very far, for he was arrested and tried by an ecclesiastical council in which Laurence of Lindores again acted as prosecutor.

Cwarar was commanded to abjure communion in both kinds, public punishment of known mortal sin, the necessity of the poverty of the church, and the free preaching of the Scriptures. This he refused to do. He was, therefore, sentenced to death, the judgment being carried out by the civil authorities.

²² Thos. Thomson, ed., *Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland* (1814), II, 7.

²³ *Copiale*, 71, 424. The action of the lecturer, a Master of Arts of the university, is a commentary upon the effectiveness of the oath of 1416.

²⁴ H. Denifle and A. Chatelaine, *Auctarium Chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis* (Paris, 1937), II, 190. I am indebted to Professor S. Harrison Thomson, University of Colorado, for some of my information regarding Cwarar's European career.

Knox adds the information that they thrust a brass ball into his mouth to keep him from preaching during his execution.²⁵

Bower, who wrote his continuation of Fordun's chronicle within the next fifteen years, accuses the Scottish Wycliffites of many other heresies. According to him they not only denied specific Catholic doctrines, but also insisted on complete communism, even to community of women. Both Bellesheim and Laing accept these views as those of Crawar, claiming that it was for his social rather than his religious opinions that he was punished. For this interpretation, however, there is no support. Bower is attacking Lollards in general, and we never find him accusing Crawar of holding the more extreme views.²⁶ Yet Bower's very vehemence, almost approaching hysteria, does seem to indicate a feeling of fear lest the Lollards should become too powerful.

It was probably this same dread that made Laurence of Lindores so relentless towards the Lollards. The same council which condemned Crawar followed his execution with an attack on all others who might hold the same opinions. According to the *Liber Pluscardensis*, the holders of such tenets were expelled from their properties and disinherited.²⁷ When later some of these, who recanted, demanded restitution, they were refused. Laurence and his council were determined to blot out heresy.

Yet even the clergy were tainted with the noxious teachings. In 1436 James Haldenstone, Prior of the cathedral chapter of St. Andrews, believed that some of his chapter were guilty of favouring Lollardy. He informed his sub-prior that one of the canons had brought him a letter received from one who claimed to have come from the Earl of Douglas. The letter contained an attack upon Haldenstone for persecuting and killing Lollards; and Haldenstone had the idea that it was written by one of the canons. He, therefore, ordered the sub-prior to convoke the chapter in order to make the guilty one confess. Whether anything came of the investigation we do not know, but it is certain that accusations contained in the letter are true. Bower tells us that when he became

25 F. J. Skene, ed., *Liber Pluscardensis* (Edinburgh), I, 377.

26 Andrew Laing, *St. Andrews* (Edinburgh, 1893), 77; Bellesheim, *Catholic Church of Scotland*, II, 56; Fordun, *Scotichronicon*, xv, 20-22.

27 *Liber Pluscardensis*, I, 378.

inquisitor in 1440, Haldenstone refuted heretics fiercely every day. This was not the testimony of an admirer, for Bower and Haldenstone seem to have been litigating at this time over the Priory of St. Andrews.²⁸

In 1437 died Laurence of Lindores, the inquisitor "who throughout the realm never gave Lollards or heretics any rest."²⁹ He was followed by Robert de Essy, vicar of Auchterhouse and master in the faculty of Arts at St. Andrews University. Essy, who seems to have done little, was followed in 1440 by Haldenstone, who apparently had no successors.

From this time to the end of the century, there is little direct information concerning the Lollards. Yet this does not mean that they recanted and returned to the fold of the church. Our lack of information is probably due to a number of causes, the most important being the unsettled condition of the country. From the death of Archibald, Earl of Douglas, the Regent, in 1439, the government of the country tended more and more to anarchy, Douglasses, Livingstones, Crichtons, Kennedies, Crawfords, and Boyds, each in turn striving for control of the crown. The church, too, became involved in the struggle, losing both its desire and power to go heresy hunting. It is therefore natural that we should lose track of the Lollards in the storm and welter of political upheaval.

Yet at the same time we do have some indirect evidence of the continuation of Lollard opinions. Bower's very violent attack on them in the '40s, and his reference to Haldenstone's activities, both indicate considerable heretical activity, at least before 1450. That it continued after that date is evidenced by the foundation charter of St. Salvator's College at St. Andrews University. This college was established by Bishop James Kennedy, of St. Andrews. Its particular aim, as set forth in its charter, was to teach theology for the purpose of building up and strengthening the faithful, and of eradicating heresy. The expression of the latter part of this objective is not very unusual in such documents, but it takes on a new significance when we remember that Kennedy had always been a tower of strength to the most extreme "ultramontaniam" in Scotland. Moreover, when in February, 1469, papal per-

²⁸ *Copiale*, 136, 178ff, 383; A. I. Cameron, ed., *The Apostolic Camera and Scottish Benefices, 1418-1488* (London, 1934), 126; *Calendar of Papal Registers—Letters* (London), VIII, 670.

²⁹ Fordun, *Scotichronicon*, II, 495.

mission was given to the college to grant the degrees of Master of Theology and Master of Arts independently of the university, it was done that the church might the better extirpate certain heresies "which the old enemy of the human race has sown in those parts."³⁰

The bestowal of this authority to grant degrees was a direct attack on the university; and this is the light in which the university authorities regarded it. A fight took place between armed students of the two institutions, while the rector of the university excommunicated the faculty and students of the college. Two years later, however, peace was restored by St. Salvator's surrender of its privileges. Yet it would seem that one of the principal reasons for the original grant of the disputed rights was heresy, probably in the university. This would lend colour to the statement of *Biographia Britannica* that many Lollards, both English and German, were attending St. Andrews about this time. By giving St. Salvator's degree granting privileges, better control could be maintained over at least a portion of the students. Yet the effort failed, for by 1500 St. Andrews University was strongly impregnated with "heretical" ideas.³¹

The growth of Lollard influence during this period is indicated also in other ways. Since there was a very considerable revival of Wycliffism in England at this time, it is probable that the same may have been true of Scotland. Walter Kennedy, writing during these years tells us that

The Schip of Faith, tempestuous wind and rane
Dryvis in the see of Lollardy that blawes.

The same poet in his "Flyting" with Dunbar refers to the latter as "Lollard laureate" and "lamp lollardorum." This was no doubt mere vituperation, for Dunbar with all his anti-clerical leanings never accepted the Lollard teachings. Nevertheless, Kennedy's words seem to indicate that Lollardy was in the air.³²

30 C. J. Lyon, *The History of St. Andrews* (Edinburgh, 1843), II, 239, 241; *Calendar of Papal Registers—Letters*, XII, 313.

31 Hannay, *The Statutes*, 29; Laing, *Lindores Abbey*, 72, 73; T. M. Lindsay, "A Literary Relic of Lollardy in Scotland," *Scottish Historical Review*, I (1904), 270.

32 Jas. Gairdner, *Lollardy and the English Reformation*, (London, 1908), I, 275; Knox, *The Reformation in Scotland*, I, 500; J. Small, ed., *Poems of William Dunbar* (Edinburgh, 1893), II, xxxi, 28; J. M. Ross, *Scottish History and Literature to the Reformation* (Glasgow, 1884), 171.

The airy substance of Lollardy, however, changes to really substantial matter in the 1490s, for we have definite evidence that the heresy was gaining considerable influence in Ayrshire, around Kyle-Stewart, King's Kyle, and Cunningham. One man, Murdock Nisbet of Loudon, who became a Lollard about 1490, was forced to fly the country because of persecution. Some time later he returned bringing with him a manuscript of Wycliffe's translation of the Bible, which he in turn translated into Scots.³³

Persecution in 1494, perhaps the same from which Nisbet escaped, brought to light some thirty other "heretics," including members of important Ayrshire families. Among them were Adam Rede of Barskimming (Sterquhite), George Campbell of Cesnock, John Campbell of Newmylns, Andrew Shaw of Polkemmet, and two daughters of Sir John Chalmers of Galdgirth: Ladies Polkellie and Stair. Archbishop Blackader of Glasgow brought charges against them before the King, but had no success in obtaining a conviction. The list of thirty-four heretical opinions was of the usual type relating to the denial of the power of the keys, the authority of the pope and bishops, etc. According to Knox, Adam Rede, who acted as spokesman, succeeded more by wit than wisdom in frustrating the Archbishop's design, and the Lollards were released. Rede's position in James IV's court no doubt helped to gain a favorable decision.³⁴

It would seem, however, that Rede soon returned to the church. According to Knox, our principal authority, when the King asked him if he would burn the bill of charges to show his recantation, he replied, "Sir, the Bishop an ye will." This has usually been taken to mean that he would prefer to burn the Bishop. But, as has been recently pointed out by Mr. D. E. Easson, Rede may have been expressing a readiness to do whatever the King desired—even to burning the Archbishop. It would be an indirect form of recantation. Yet even, if he did not turn back at this time, he must have done so later. In February, 1507, he sent a proctor to the Roman Curia to plead a case for him. Then a month later, in an instrument of Mr.

33 T. G. Law, ed., *New Testament in Scots* (Edinburgh, 1901), x (Scot. Text Society); Thos. M'Crie, *The Life of Andrew Melville* (Edinburgh, 1824), I, 419.

34 Knox, *The Reformation in Scotland*, I, 4-11; *Register of the Great Seal of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1882), II, No. 2454.

Martin Rede, chancellor of the diocese of Glasgow, Adam Rede appears as a witness. One can hardly imagine a staunch Lollard doing either of these things!³⁵

The Campbells, however, maintained their principles more firmly; and with them probably stood the Chalmers. These two families had intermarried considerably, George Campbell of Cesnock being the husband of Margaret Chalmers, sister of ladies Polkellie and Stair. These two families in turn may have been connected with the Shaws of Polkemmet who had a representative tried for heresy at the same time. Although we have no record apart from Knox of an Andrew Shaw, we do find notice of a William Shaw of Polkemmet who was perhaps the same man. He was married to a Margaret Campbell, probably related to the Campbells of Cesnock.³⁶ Heresy seems to have been mainly transmitted through family relationship.

The identity of George Campbell of Cesnock is easily settled, for he was deputy-sheriff of Ayr from 1504 to 1508. Then on his death he was succeeded by his son and heir, another George.³⁷ John Campbell of Newmylms is more difficult to place. It has been suggested that he was a son of George Campbell of Cesnock. This is possible, as the latter had a son John. Others think that he may have been one of the John Campbells of Loudon or Nether Loudon. This, however, has one obstacle in the way of its acceptance. The Campbells of Cesnock and the Campbells of Loudon do not seem to have been on very good terms, as they were continually quarreling with each other.³⁸ But on the evidence which we possess, we cannot settle the matter definitely.

That the Campbells maintained their doctrinal views is made fairly certain by a statement of Alexius in his *Responsio ad Cochlei Columnias*. He refers to John Campbell, Laird of Cesnock, who during the reign of James IV had the Scriptures read and expounded in his home by a priest. For this he, his

35 D. E. Easson, "The Lollards of Kyle," *Juridical Review*, XLVIII (Edinburgh, 1936), 127; J. Bain and C. Rogers, *The Diocesan Registers of Glasgow* (London, 1875), II, 156 (Grampian Club).

36 Knox, *The Reformation in Scotland*, I, 7; J. Balfour Paul, ed., *The Scots Peerage* (Edinburgh, 1911), VIII, 114, 115; *Reg. Grt. Seal*, II, No. 1669, 2067, 2315.

37 *Reg. Grt. Seal*, II, No. 2836; *Register of the Privy Seal of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1908), I, No. 1663.

38 *Reg. Grt. Seal*, II, No. 3158, 3638; Easson, "The Lollards of Kyle," 125.

wife, and the priest were arrested and condemned to death, but the sentence was not carried out. The King interfered on their behalf, and by his good offices they were released. The identity of this John Campbell is hard to ascertain. Some believe that it was George Campbell, while others think that it was his son John. But here again we are left without any real certainty on the matter.³⁹

In 1504, Archbishop Blackader offered to give Campbell of Cesnock and Campbell of Newmylms attestations concerning their trial for heresy. Whether they accepted them, or why this offer was made we are not told. Yet this does give us some evidence that the Lollards were open in professing their religious beliefs.⁴⁰

Even more bold was the next generation. In 1511 a certain Sir John Leiche was haled before the commissary court of the Archbishop of Glasgow. The accusation was made that he had taken part in a raid on the royal chapel of Dundonald in which all the books and ornaments had been either stolen or destroyed. The complainant was John Rede, brother of Adam Rede of Barskimming, while the proctor for the accused was the deputy-sheriff of Ayr, George Campbell of Cesnock. Leiche admitted that he had taken part in the raid, but that he was there only as a helper of Campbell, who was apparently the leader. One cannot but wonder if this was a rather rough means of repaying Rede of Barskimming for his desertion of the cause. But even if it were not, it shows clearly the immunity which the Lollards possessed in face of the anger of even such a doughty churchman as Archbishop James Beaton.⁴¹

On the distaff side the same adherence to the Lollard principles was manifested, albeit somewhat less violently. George Campbell of Cesnock, the second laird, had a sister who married Robert Campbell of Kinyeancleugh. This couple maintained Lollard views until the coming of the Reformation.⁴² Thus in one family we have a direct connection between Lollardy and the Reformation. Like them there were, no doubt, many others

39 John Duke, *A History of the Church of Scotland to the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1937), 131; Thos. Calderwood, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1842), I, 54 (Wodrow Society).

40 *Dioc. Regs. Glasgow*, II, 50.

41 *Ibid.*, 415.

42 M'Crie, *Andrew Melville*, I, 419.

of whom we have no record. It was these people who prepared the way religiously for the Reformation. Tracing their spiritual ancestry back to the English refugees and Bohemian missionaries at the beginning of the fifteenth century, they had laid the ground for a religious revolution. Although by 1500 they had followers among university students and the lesser nobility, they were still in a small minority. Yet the treatment accorded to them by James IV showed not only the indifference and opposition of the nobility to the Roman Church, but also an increase in Lollard prestige and power.

When Lutheran teachings began to filter into the country, the preparation laid by the Lollards became immediately apparent. Ayrshire became a hot-bed of Reformation sentiment as testified by the number of martyrs which came from that part of the country. Other regions also showed by their adherence to the new teachings that they were by no means entirely new. Thus when we attempt to understand the causes of the Protestant revolt in Scotland, along with political and economic forces, we must reckon also the influence and spread of Lollard teachings during the preceding century.

HENRY MELCHIOR MUHLENBERG AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The growing tension between the American colonies and England in the decade preceding the Revolution confronted conscientious colonists with the necessity of making a difficult decision. Pressure to reach a decision was immeasurably increased when friction developed into war. It was relatively easy for some colonists to make up their minds as to whether or not they should remain loyal to the British crown. Those who were called Whigs or Tories recognized no serious problem; political ideals and allegiances, considerations of self-interest, and long standing prejudices united in various ways to make them zealous patriots or ardent loyalists. But these extremists were in a decided minority at the beginning of the Revolution. The majority of the colonists occupied ground somewhere in between; they were conservatives who hoped for a compromise solution of the differences between England and America, or wavered in distrustful indecision, or had no conviction whatsoever in the matter. It would be unjust lightly to prejudge their motives as of necessity either nobler or baser than those of the patriots and loyalists. Particularly unhappy was the lot of those who were unable to reach a conscientious decision either for or against the struggle for independence.

Henry Melchior Muhlenberg was such a man.¹ Two

1 The position taken by Muhlenberg with reference to the American Revolution has been singularly ignored or distorted. William J. Mann, whose reliable *Life and Times of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg* (Philadelphia, 1887) devotes comparatively little space to the last twenty years of Muhlenberg's life, passes by the Revolution with a few generalizations (pp. 481-86). Others have not examined the sources. H. M. M. Richards glibly asserts in his *The Pennsylvania German in the Revolutionary War* (Lancaster, 1908), 428: "So great was his [Muhlenberg's] patriotism during the Revolution that he became a marked man and was obliged to flee from Philadelphia to his home at the Trappe when the British entered it [Philadelphia] after the Battle of Brandywine." Theodore E. Schmauk quotes with approval the words of J. F. Sachse: "Every clergyman sent out by Halle [Muhlenberg was their leader] was loyal to the patriots and espoused their cause during the revolutionary period"—T. E. Schmauk, *A History of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania, 1638-1820* (Philadelphia, 1903), I, 206. Such facile generalizations are widely accepted as true. The present study goes back to the sources,

hundred years have now passed since he was sent, in 1742, from Halle, Saxony, to minister to the scattered and shepherdless German Lutheran colonists in southeastern Pennsylvania. For more than thirty years, prior to the Revolution, he had consumed himself in the service of his Lord and his fellow-believers, extending his ministry to German settlements along the entire length of the Atlantic seaboard. In 1745 he had married a native American girl, daughter of Conrad Weiser, the Indian agent, and had raised a family of seven children. As the years passed he improved his scant knowledge of the English language until he could speak it fluently, even if not without traces of his foreign extraction. Although, as a Hanoverian by birth, he was already a subject of King George, he was naturalized in 1754. He is known to have exercised his suffrage, and in 1766 his sermon of thanksgiving, preached on the occasion of the repeal of the Stamp Act, was published.² He moved with considerable ease in the society of rich and poor, cultured and uncultured, and he counted among his friends and acquaintances many men of influence and authority in church and state. He had identified himself with the American colonies as completely as any immigrant, from whatever country in Europe, had done in the eighteenth century.

Then came the war. During the year of hostilities which preceded the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, Muhlenberg was deeply troubled. He was dismayed by what was happening and he was uncertain as to the course he ought to pursue. He had always been shy and timid by nature, according to his own confession, and he had always shrunk back from making difficult decisions. But the beginning of the war seemed to place him in a quandary such as he had not known before.

As he pondered over his position he recalled the many ties that bound him to England. He was a native of the Electorate of Hanover; as such he had been "a subject of Their Majesties George I, George II, and George III by virtue of birth

most of which are manuscripts in the Archives of the Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania located in the library of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia.

² *Ein Zeugniß von der Güte und Ernst Gottes gegen sein Bundesvolk in alten und neuen Zeiten und des Volkes Undankbarkeit, gelegentlich des Dankfestes wegen Aufhebung der Stempel-Acte, 1. August, 1766.* Printed by Henrich Miller in Philadelphia.

as well as of naturalization." He had attended "His Royal Majesty's University at Göttingen" for three years. He had received his call to Pennsylvania at the hands of Court Chaplain Ziegenhagen in London³ and had sailed to Charleston, South Carolina, "on a royal packet boat." In 1752 Governor Hamilton, of Pennsylvania, had provided him with "a passport and recommendation addressed to all the high authorities in His Royal Majesty's colonies" to enable him to travel without let or hindrance in the performance of his missionary labors. From the time of his arrival in America he had been in constant correspondence with distinguished members of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge in London, from whom he had received financial aid as well as encouragement and counsel.⁴ Muhlenberg also recalled that "the inestimable Constitution of the British Empire has established one Church and allows in His Majesty's Dominions Liberty of Conscience and free Exercise of Protestant Religion. . . . This indulging Toleration animated many thousand frugal and industrious Germans to leave their native Country, to settle and improve the North- and South-American Provinces."⁵ Thus not only Muhlenberg himself, but also his countrymen whom he had come to serve, had ample reason to remember with gratitude what British sovereigns had done for them since the days of Queen Anne. The privileges and liberties enjoyed "in this inordinately free climate" were too frequently forgotten and abused by the people, Muhlenberg believed.⁶

Muhlenberg's reluctance to espouse the cause of the patriots was shared by his most trusted colleagues. Their opinions undoubtedly carried much weight with Muhlenberg and contributed to his own troubled indecision. His son-in-law and as-

3 Friedrich Michael Ziegenhagen (1694-1777) was the German Lutheran chaplain of the Royal Chapel of St. James, sometimes called the Royal German Chapel, which was founded in the time of Prince George of Denmark, consort of Queen Anne. The Lutherans in Pennsylvania had appealed to Ziegenhagen as well as to Gotthilf August Francke, of Halle, for a pastor.

4 German letter, Muhlenberg to David Grim, of New York City, January 14, 1778. This manuscript letter, like all manuscript materials cited below, except where otherwise stated, is in the Lutheran Archives in Philadelphia.

5 English MS. letter, Muhlenberg to the Governor and Council of Georgia, January 31, 1775.

6 *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, edited and translated by T. G. Tappert and J. W. Doberstein, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1942), I, 376; *Journals*, September 18, 1774, etc. (Volumes II and III of Muhlenberg's *Journals* will come from the press in the next few years; they must be cited here by date entries.)

sistant in Philadelphia, the Rev. John Christopher Kunze, cautiously avoided frank public discussion of the war. "Political judgments concerning it I gladly leave to others," he wrote,⁷ "although I wish from the bottom of my heart that the Lord might direct the heart of our Sovereign, from whom the colonies do not really wish to be separated, to grant us those liberties which we formerly enjoyed. My real judgment about it [the war] is theological. . . . British America seems now to have come sufficiently of age to be included under such prophetic rubrics as Jeremiah 46-52 and Ezekiel 25-32. But the Lord still has compassion for the sake of forty or fifty. Many a faithful soul is still praying in America and many a Moses is still lifting prayerful hands in Europe." Another trusted colleague expressed himself even more pointedly. "It is true," the Rev. J. H. C. Helmuth, of Lancaster, wrote,⁸ "that England has by its sins deserved the rupture which God may permit. But this land has been equally deserving of God's severe visitation. It is the hearty desire and sigh of all honest people that the Lord may turn the heart of our dear King to us again, allow us the liberties formerly granted to us, and thus reunite us in peace with the Crown under which this land was so happily governed. The present disturbances cause no little harm to Christendom. . . . There are many preachers in the American army who exercise the functions of pastor and military officer simultaneously. I myself know two of them, one a colonel and the other a captain. It is not uncommon for preachers publicly to extol and make martyrs of those on the American side who are shot. Most of the people are full of enthusiasm for liberty. . . . The few who think differently do not dare to speak otherwise. If some are so indiscreet, they receive such ill treatment that others lose all inclination to give even the slightest sign that they are opposed to the policy which has been adopted. In my opinion it is best for a preacher in this land to preach repentance and faith all the more earnestly now that the people are less willing to hear these things. To speak against the cause would be unwise and

7 Letter to his superiors in Halle, dated July 18, 1775, and printed in *Nachrichten von den vereinigten Deutschen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Gemeinen in Nord-America*, neue Ausgabe herausgegeben von J. L. Schulze, W. J. Mann, B. M. Schmucker, und W. Germann (Band I. Allentown, 1886; Band II, Philadelphia, 1895), Vol. II, pp. 706-07. This work is commonly called the *Hallesche Nachrichten* or *Halle Reports*.

8 Letter to Halle, dated August 25, 1775, in *Hallesche Nachrichten*, II, 703-04.

without the slightest effect. To speak for the cause would be dangerous since, for my poor part, I cannot determine whether America is doing the right thing or not." Such were the opinions of the men whose judgment Muhlenberg held in high esteem.

Muhlenberg also had good reason to suspect how his ecclesiastical superiors in Halle would feel about the Revolution. It was rumored in New York that the Rev. Dr. Gottlieb Anastasius Freylinghausen, director of the Halle Institutions, had sent a letter to the Lutheran clergymen in America, advising them to have nothing whatsoever to do with the rebels. Muhlenberg denied having seen this letter,⁹ which may have been intercepted by the British. Moreover, he may not have seen that number of the Halle Reports which appeared in the same year and in which Freylinghausen indicated indirectly how he expected the Lutheran clergymen in America to conduct themselves. Be that as it may, Muhlenberg could not have been uninfluenced by the directions which he must have known, almost instinctively, that his ecclesiastical superiors would give. "It would be improper," Freylinghausen wrote,¹⁰ "for a preacher of the Gospel who is to be a disciple of the blameless Jesus, and it would be prejudicial to the religion of Jesus for His witness-bearers to meddle in secular affairs or even go so far as to attempt to create disorder in the state. Jesus did not interfere in the least in worldly matters, for He was not even willing to speak a good word, in the interest of a fair division, to the unjust brother who was keeping back the inheritance [Luke 12:13-14]. His whole behavior makes it sufficiently clear that His kingdom is not of this world." After discussing how scandalous it would be for clergymen to engage in seditious activities against their lawful government, Dr. Freylinghausen concluded: "There is ample justification for rejoicing that our preachers [in America] are far from supporting or increasing the disturbances which have arisen in the body politic by inciting the minds of the people. They do well to preach, to those who bear His name, repentance and conversion and faith in Christ and Christian discipleship, even as they have been taught to do, and to give neither party

9 *Journals*, December 4, 1776; German MS. letter, Mrs. J. C. (Margaretha) Kunze to H. M. Muhlenberg, dated November 5, 1777.

10 *Hallesche Nachrichten*, II, 708.

occasion for increased bitterness. We have good reason to conclude, from that which Mr. Kunze and Mr. Helmuth write about themselves, what the conduct of the other united preachers is, at least those who were sent to Pennsylvania from Halle and are united with one another in oneness of mind and spirit." These words of Freylinghausen were obviously intended to warn the Lutheran clergy to remain aloof from the contending parties in the political arena.

All that Muhlenberg said and did during the year 1775 indicates that he was in complete agreement with his colleagues in America and with his superiors in Europe. That his eldest son, John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg, was acting quite differently and was at this very time serving as chairman of the Committee of Safety and Correspondence in Dunmore County, Virginia, and as a delegate to the revolutionary Virginia Convention, does not alter this fact. The Halle authorities seem to have regarded Peter as untrustworthy and irresponsible ever since he ran away from his unhappy apprenticeship in Lübeck, and Father Muhlenberg, who criticized many other steps in his son's career, by no means approved of his meddling in politics now.¹¹ "But he was no longer under my supervision and jurisdiction," the father explained later.¹² "He was 250 miles away and became involved against my will and warning. Besides, who does not know the depressing effects of civil wars? Fathers are arrayed against sons, sons against fathers, and brothers and neighbors against one another. . . . Deuteronomy 24:16, 'The fathers shall not be put to death for the children.' Ezekiel 18:20, 'The father shall not bear the iniquity of the son.'"

Muhlenberg's position was clearly asserted in July, 1775, when he refused to be a party to a political appeal. A member of the Continental Congress visited him and asked him, along

11 C. F. Huch, "General Peter Mühlenberg," in *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Pionier-Vereins von Philadelphia*, 2. Heft (1906), 2-13; W. Germann, "Crisis in the Life of Peter Muhlenberg," in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XXXVII, 298 ff.; the same in H. A. Rattermann's *Deutsch-Amerikanisches Magazin*; E. W. Hocker, *The Fighting Parson of the American Revolution: A Biography of General Peter Muhlenberg* (Philadelphia, 1936), 50-58. Manuscript letters and documents in the Archives of the Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, also throw light on H. M. Muhlenberg's relations with his son Peter.

12 German MS. letter, Muhlenberg to David Grim, of New York City, January 14, 1778.

with other German clergymen, to prepare a statement for circulation among German colonists, exhorting them to support the patriot cause because England was jeopardizing the privileges and liberties of the people. Muhlenberg replied: "Dear Sir, as far as I know, all the intelligent members of our Lutheran congregations are faithful subjects of His Royal Majesty, our sovereign. It is not proper for a clergyman to prepare such a statement as you demand. Besides, it is customary to publish political matters in the newspapers." This reply, as Muhlenberg observed, did not please his visitor.¹³ But it was in complete conformity with Muhlenberg's studied attempt at this time to avoid taking sides. It was also consistent with his and his colleagues' earlier policy of remaining aloof from involvement in political controversies. In 1748 there had been a sharp difference of opinion in the province of Pennsylvania with respect to defense against the Spaniards and French. Political differences followed lines of religious persuasion. The Quakers, supported by Mennonites and other "Separatists," opposed defense as "ungodly and contrary to the command of Jesus Christ," while Anglicans and Presbyterians strongly urged defense on the ground that it was right and necessary and in accord with the laws of nature." During this bitter controversy, Muhlenberg reported,¹⁴ "our pastors' *collegium* has been sharply watched to see which side we would turn to. We said, however, that we had been sent to preach to our people repentance to God and faith in the Lord Jesus, and hence we could not mix in political affairs unless we had express orders from our highest or provincial government; accordingly we remained silent. Graciously give us peace, Lord God, in our time. Amen."

Muhlenberg recognized, in 1775, that it would become increasingly difficult for him to act in accordance with his conscience as long as he remained in Philadelphia, the capital of the resisting colonies. He could not remain in public office

13 *Loc. cit.* The statement in question was actually drafted and published, but not, as frequently stated, with Muhlenberg's permission or approval. The 40-page statement bears the title: *Schreiben des Evangelisch-Lutherischen und Reformirten Kirchen-Rathes wie auch der Beamten der Deutschen Gesellschaft in der Stadt Philadelphia an die Deutschen Einwohner der Provinzen Neu-York und Nord-Carolina*. For a brief summary of the pamphlet in English see Mann, *Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, 484-85.

14 *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, I, 212.

there, he said,¹⁵ because "I had no protection as long as I was unwilling for conscientious reasons to change my oath of allegiance. As a private person in the country I was safer and was able to pray in tranquility for all and sundry, for friends and foes." Before the close of the year 1775, therefore, he made up his mind to flee to the apparent security of the village of Trappe, twenty-five miles away. He was convinced, as he put it,¹⁶ that "the flames of war will spread farther over the united North American provinces in the next few years. . . . Cities like New York, Charleston, Philadelphia, etc., which are closest to the ocean and which possess inflammable materials of superior moral or physical character, are, according to human reckoning, most exposed to trial and danger. When storms and tempests gather, a clucking hen, albeit but an irrational little creature, instinctively seeks some spot in which she might have shelter for herself and her young ones. . . . Troubled by such thoughts, which came not from unbelief but from concern, I happened by chance upon a notice in the English newspaper offering a place in Providence [Trappe, Pennsylvania] for sale. . . . In consideration of its nearness to one of our original congregations which has no parsonage although it has a debt-free church and schoolhouse,¹⁷ in view of the decline of the oldest united congregation in New Hanover,¹⁸ and because a place (neither too near the city nor too near the Indian frontiers) is needed in the present crisis as a refuge for fleeing pastors, their families, widows, etc., I resolved to buy the place." The purchase was concluded January 1, 1776. Some necessary renovations were made and Muhlenberg moved into his new house with his wife and youngest daughter in March. On rare occasions he returned to Philadelphia "to perform the service of a vicar," but he lived in comparative retirement on a pension.

15 German MS. letter, Muhlenberg to David Grim, January 14, 1778. Mann carelessly states (*Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, 491), that Muhlenberg left Philadelphia because he "could not be expected to expose himself in that city to the rudeness of the enemy [the British] and to jeopardize life and personal freedom."

16 Manuscript volume PM 95, A 1774-75, pp. 673-79, and PM 95, A 1775-77, pp. 31-33.

17 Augustus Lutheran Church, Trappe, Pa.

18 The oldest of the three "united congregations" which originally called Muhlenberg was the "Swamp Church" in New Hanover, organized at some undetermined time between 1695 and 1703. The third of the original "united congregations" was St. Michael's (now St. Michael's and Zion) in Philadelphia.

However, the removal to Trappe did not solve Muhlenberg's problem. He was greatly embarrassed by the continued political activity of his son Peter. When Peter accepted a commission as colonel of the Eighth Virginia Regiment (in January, 1776) and exchanged his clerical vestments for the uniform of an army officer, his brother, Frederick Augustus Conrad Muhlenberg, at the time pastor in New York City, sent Peter a long, sarcastic letter¹⁹ in which he expressed the severest criticism and condemnation. "You have become too involved in matters with which, as a preacher, you have nothing whatsoever to do and which do not belong to your office. . . . Nothing can excuse you, a preacher, unless it be the conduct of many bishops in England who have in similar fashion drawn the sword against us." Peter had previously attempted to defend his conduct by writing, "I am a Clergyman, it is true, but I am a member of Society as well as the poorest Layman, & my Liberty is as dear to me as to any Man; shall I then sit still and enjoy myself at Home when the best Blood of the Continent is spilling? Heaven forbid it!" To this Frederick replied: "*Verba, praetercaque nihil*. If we have a ministry, let us wait on our ministering. Of course you should not loaf lazily at home, but you should administer the important office which is incumbent upon you to the best of your ability. Then if you are convinced in your heart that our cause is just, you will find sufficient opportunity in your calling to contribute your share to the cause of liberty. In this way you will do more good, on the whole, than by going off now and perhaps, as a consequence, forfeiting your life." The trouble with Peter, according to his brother, was that he acted indiscreetly from the very beginning. He should never have accepted political office, or he might at least have resigned his offices long ago. The only way in which he could now extricate himself from a bad mess, as Peter himself intimated, was to plunge in deeper. In this frank letter Frederick echoed the views of his father.

But Frederick was already struggling with himself. "I have been wrestling for a long time with perplexities of my own," he confided to Peter. "I look upon the office of preacher

19 A copy is in the MS. *Tagebuch für F. A. C. Mühlberg, angefangen am 25. October, 1770*, 86-94, located in the Archives of Trinity Lutheran Church, Reading, Pennsylvania.

as the most difficult and important of all. I acknowledge my own utter unfitness for it and know how poorly I am equipped to fulfill the great and important duties which it carries with it. Perhaps this comes from the fact that I am not indisposed to believe that a preacher can lay down his office with a good conscience and take up another calling. You think that one can be a preacher and a colonel at the same time. How different are our ways of thinking!" When, in July, 1776, it appeared that the British might occupy New York City, Frederick fled to his father's home in Trappe. On the ground that there was no vacant parish at the time with a salary adequate to the support of his family, Frederick proposed to take up secular work. His brother-in-law, J. C. Kunze, criticized Frederick for thinking of demitting the ministry and asserted that Frederick's complaint that "he cannot live" on the income from a parish really meant that "he cannot become rich" in the ministry.²⁰ For a short time Frederick served as pastor in New Hanover, but finally made up his mind in 1779 to give up the ministry and enter politics. Through the mediation of his father-in-law and other friends in Philadelphia, Frederick was proposed to the governor and assembly of Pennsylvania for election as a member of Congress "because he understands English and German." His father observed:²¹ "The impending matter strikes me as grave and fearful. It drives me to seek recourse in the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer, 'Lead us not into temptation.' . . . I should much prefer to see the Swedish corporation call him as pastor to Wicaco."²² But Frederick was not stayed by his father's wishes or counsel. He embarked on a political career which eventually carried him to the halls of the United States Congress, where he was chosen first Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Meanwhile Father Muhlenberg was deeply grieved by

20 German MS. letter, J. C. Kunze to H. M. Muhlenberg, November 30, 1778; H. M. Muhlenberg's manuscript volume PM 95, A 1775-77, p. 60.

21 *Journals*, February 15, 1779.

22 The Swedish corporation, i. e. the vestry or church council of the Swedish Lutheran Church in Wicaco, now South Philadelphia. Prior to this Muhlenberg had urged his son Henry Ernestus to do what he could to have the congregation elect a German-English pastor to take the place of the Swedish pastor who was planning to return to his native land (*Journals*, January 30, 1779). Later, in 1783 and 1784, Muhlenberg tried to persuade Frederick to accept a call to the battle-scarred Salzburgers' Ebenezer Church in Georgia or to find a professorship somewhere (*Journals*, August 12, 1783; letters of Muhlenberg to the elders and deacons in Ebenezer, Georgia, January 12, January 20, and June 24, 1784).

the conduct of two of his sons. His journals and correspondence reflect the gloom into which their activities plunged him. His nights as well as his days were troubled and anxious. "Was much concerned about Peter in my dreams," a fairly typical entry in his journals reads. "My heart is heavy with the thought of poor Peter and Frederick," he wrote to his youngest son Henry Ernestus, who alone remained at his father's side in the ministry.²³ Again he lamented,²⁴ "If Gabriel [i. e. Peter] and Frederick had only remained in their calling! If they had not allowed themselves to be betrayed to the profane world! One who suffers in the service of Christ for the sake of truth and righteousness is rewarded with grace and comfort; but not one who suffers because of meddlesomeness and evildoing, for then these words apply: 'Thine own wickedness shall correct thee' [Jeremiah 2:19]."

These are strong words of reproof. Muhlenberg was a worried father whose two sons were in danger, and he was a churchman who grieved over the defection of two clergymen from the already depleted ranks of the ministry. But recurring, too, in all Muhlenberg's lamentations was the deep distrust of the independence movement. *Vox populi*, he reminded a correspondent,²⁵ is not necessarily *vox Dei*; it may be *vox diaboli*. The trouble, he wrote in his journals, is that "the people do not understand the word 'independence' aright. They act as if they were now independent of God and His precepts. What happened in Jeremiah's time, Jeremiah 5:1-6, is happening again." "What will happen ultimately to the American fig tree? It almost seems as if the holy Lord has issued the righteous command (Luke 13:7), 'Cut it down!'"²⁶ In similar vein he wrote to his son Frederick:²⁷ "The independent body is worn out, its moral heart is faint, the soles of its feet are wounded down to the sinews, and the whole body is nerve-shattered. . . . It has made me quite sorrowful and it drives me more and more to penitent prayer and inter-

23 German MS. letter, H. M. Muhlenberg to G. H. E. Muhlenberg, September 29, 1780. Young Henry also thought for a while of demitting the ministry (*Journals*, March 14, 1777).

24 German MS. letter, H. M. Muhlenberg to G. H. E. Muhlenberg, March 27, 1782.

25 German MS. letter, H. M. Muhlenberg to Governor Treutlen of Georgia, October 14, 1777.

26 *Journals*, April 25, 1780; September 21, 1781.

27 German MS. letter, H. M. Muhlenberg to F. A. C. Muhlenberg, April 3, 1780.

cession to think that two of my tenderly loved offshoots were not sufficiently compact and heavy to remain in the valley and, instead of suffering poverty and shame with the rude covenant people, preferred to allow themselves to be drawn up with the dew into the air, from whence in the course of nature they will fall down again, drop by drop, unless God in His mercy permits something extraordinary to happen."

There is another sense in which the removal to Trappe did not solve Muhlenberg's problem with respect to his position toward the Revolution. He had hoped, by fleeing from Philadelphia, to escape from what he foresaw would be a battleground. But the war followed him to his retreat. The British occupied Philadelphia in September, 1777, and remained until the following July. During that winter the American army was encamped at Valley Forge and there were frequent skirmishes between the two armies. Trappe was not far from Valley Forge. Refugees swarmed out of Philadelphia into that neighborhood before and during the occupation of the city. British troops made several forays in the direction of Trappe and threatened, as Muhlenberg believed, to destroy the village. Again and again Muhlenberg was alarmed by the rumble of cannon fire in the distance. It was not pleasant to dwell between the encampments of hostile armies. On October 14, 1776, Muhlenberg bought a wagon for use in case it became necessary to flee farther into the country. The following spring he was considering the advisability of escaping to Virginia. A year after that he again hired a wagon for flight and was, in fact, on the point of leaving Trappe when the danger passed and made flight unnecessary. Only his wife's "perversity" and grave illness kept Muhlenberg in Trappe.²⁸

The frequent movement of American troops through Trappe, either in large bodies or in foraging groups, gave Muhlenberg an opportunity to observe them at first hand. He had some unhappy experiences with deserters, drunken soldiers, and marauders. Once his horse was stolen. On another occasion he became very angry when militiamen stole his chick-

²⁸ *Journals*, October 14, 1776; September 17, 1777; May 20, 1778. German MS. letter, Muhlenberg to Kunze, March 7, 1777. Mrs. Muhlenberg's affliction was variously described by her husband as "epileptic convulsions," "hysterical paroxysms *cum clamore*," and "*epilepsia uterina*" with a variety of complications. To attempt to reason with a hypochondriac and hysterical woman, Muhlenberg complained, is of little avail.

ens and trampled down his crops in the fields.²⁹ When a company of Pennsylvania militiamen arrived in Trappe, Muhlenberg recorded³⁰ characteristically that they "came with drums and fifes and great shouting. Most of them were young fellows who had learned frontier fighting and could imitate the battle cries or war whoops of the Indians, which sound semitonic, inhuman, fierce, and strangely beautiful, almost like the battle cry of the Turks. To be sure, it would have sounded better and been more encouraging if they had selected Psalm 46 or the hymn 'A mighty fortress is our God' as their war cry. But *quale subjectum tale praedicatum*; one cannot gather grapes of thorns." Muhlenberg had a rather low opinion of the rank and file of the American army, and this was confirmed, he believed, by their shameful desecration of church buildings. Among many others, the Lutheran church in Trappe was temporarily occupied by troops in September, 1777. "When I reached the church," Muhlenberg wrote,³¹ "I discovered to my sorrow that a company of Pennsylvania militia had taken possession of the Augustus church and schoolhouse. The church was full of officers and soldiers with their guns. Up above, around the organ, all was filled, and one of them was playing on the organ while the rest were singing to the accompaniment. Down below straw and manure were scattered about, and some had placed objects of their gluttony, etc., on the altar. In short, I saw in miniature the abomination of desolation in a holy place. I went in but did not deem it advisable to say anything to the mob because they had already begun to jeer and several of the officers called out to the organ player to play a Hessian march, etc. I sought out the commander, Dunlap, and asked him if this was the renowned protection of civil and religious liberty. He apologized, saying that it was impossible to keep the militia, consisting as it did of all kinds of people, in proper discipline. . . . If one utters so much as a word of protest, the cry goes up, 'You are a Tory!' and one's house and property are threatened with fire." The following spring Muhlenberg protested vigorously against the proposed conversion of the church into a hospital. Such confiscations

29 *Journals*, September 3, 27, November 25, 1776; September 19, December 9, 1777; April 24, November 22, 1778; *et passim*.

30 *Journals*, July 28, 1776; cf. July 23, 1776.

31 *Journals*, September 27, 1777.

of church property, he wrote,³² "are hardly to be found among Turks and Persians. Much less is it customary in Christian Kingdoms and States, . . . except the degenerated Brittons who of late have spared the Popish Chappels and Quaker-Meetings in Philadelphia and profaned our churches."

Here, as elsewhere, Americans and Englishmen were denounced impartially for their pillage, desecration, ill treatment of prisoners, and other atrocities.³³ As far as the Hessian mercenaries are concerned, Muhlenberg believed that they were not responsible for the outrages committed by the opponents of the American colonies. Captured Hessians said that "they were told by the officers that Americans are wild cannibals, especially those who wear shaggy clothing, and that these must by all means be put out of the way if they wish to escape being tortured and eaten alive." Muhlenberg points out that the Americans in "shaggy clothing" were German sharpshooters from the frontier who dressed somewhat like the Indians. Then he added the observation: "In this way the Hessians are incited to set upon men of their own race and blood, for the crafty Britons prefer to line graves with foreign mercenaries rather than to fill them with their own native and lordly bodies."³⁴

The criticism which Muhlenberg leveled at the American soldiers was never shared by their commander-in-chief, for Muhlenberg always spoke of George Washington in terms of the highest regard and esteem. "Today I heard a beautiful story," he wrote on one occasion.³⁵ "It is reported that His Excellency General Washington rode about in his army yesterday and admonished all to be God-fearing, to abandon the wickedness which has been introduced and which is abounding, and to be diligent in the exercise of Christian virtues. To all appearances this man does not belong to the profane world, for he heeds God's Word, believes in the atonement by Christ, and conducts himself with humility and weakness, etc. For this reason God has preserved him in a particular, indeed wonderful, manner from misfortune in countless perils, reverses, fatigues, etc. and has graciously kept him even until

32 English MS. letter, no addressee given, June 17, 1778.

33 E. g. *Journals*, December 28, 1776, January 8, 1777, July 20-21, 1778, July 21, 1779, etc.

34 *Journals*, November 8, 1776; cf. July 6, 1778.

35 *Journals*, May 7, 1778.

now as a weapon in His hand. II Chronicles 1-3." In 1783 Muhlenberg recorded the fact that Washington laid down his office as commander-in-chief and quoted part of the farewell address in which Washington "offers exceedingly wise rules according to which the new independent states must conduct their affairs if they are to preserve and enjoy the privileges and liberty which have been won by great bloodshed."³⁶ The legend that Muhlenberg entertained Washington in his home lacks the support of documentary evidence, but he did receive another George Washington into his home when he baptized a grandson who was named after the general.³⁷

At all events, the flight from Philadelphia did not enable Muhlenberg to escape from the war. The proximity of Valley Forge and the presence in Trappe of colonial soldiers caused demands of various kinds to be laid upon him. He was asked to store army provisions in his cellar, to give shelter to passing soldiers, and occasionally to serve meals to American officers and their men. He responded to these requests and demands with great reluctance, but he did so because he was afraid of being called a Tory and threatened with harm.³⁸ When militiamen were departing for service or returning to their homes, Muhlenberg was sometimes called upon to preach to them at special services in the Trappe church. "I am glad to be of service to everybody," he wrote, "but in the present critical circumstances it is easy to be misunderstood by one side or the other. Yet one also has an opportunity to point out the real causes from which chastisements and punishments spring and to commend repentance." When requested to perform a similar service a few weeks later, Muhlenberg recorded: "I could not refuse with a good conscience and hence acceded to their request, for one must be impartial in love and must imitate the heavenly Father who lets His sun shine on the good and the evil and lets the rain fall on the just and the unjust. I am not commanded, nor is it possible for me, to inquire and decide which party has the higher or better justice on its side." On another occasion a service of this kind was called off, "which pleased me," Muhlenberg wrote, "because one can easily be misunderstood by one side or the other in such

³⁶ *Journals*, July 28, 1783.

³⁷ *Journals*, November 24, 1779.

³⁸ *Journals*, December 12, 1777; March 15, 1778; *et passim*.

critical circumstances."³⁹ It was with great reluctance, too, that Muhlenberg interceded with American army officers in behalf of parishioners and others who were charged with desertion or sedition or who were in trouble for other reasons.⁴⁰ He even found it necessary to justify his observance of special fast days appointed by the revolutionary government. His constant appeal was to Romans 13 as he urged all Lutherans, whether in territory controlled at the time by the British or in territory controlled by the Americans, "to be obedient and loyal to the government which actually has power over us and protects us."⁴¹

So reluctant was Muhlenberg to commit himself in any way either for or against the cause of independence that he was caught in a cross-fire of suspicions and charges. In a pamphlet published in Philadelphia during the British occupation of that city, he was denounced as a rebel. A German jailer in Philadelphia threatened to arrest and hang him on the supposition that he was a patriot. It was commonly reported that British and Hessian officers in Philadelphia intended to capture Muhlenberg and that he had been singled out by them for imprisonment and vengeance. For some time his son-in-law was forbidden by the British authorities to write to Muhlenberg on the ground that he was a rebel. Such charges and suspicions, reaching the ear of Muhlenberg, made him bitter. "This comes" he wrote, "of being neutral!"⁴² But Muhlenberg was equally disturbed by charges that he was a Tory. Early in the Revolution it was said, especially in Reading, Pennsylvania, that King George III had become a Roman Catholic and that Muhlenberg had been summoned to England to serve as royal chaplain. It was rumored that he was conniving with England to introduce an ecclesiastical tax and that he was opposed to colonial self-defense, on which account, it was said, he had been tarred and feathered. There was more foundation for the charges that he continued to pray for the King (he did so publicly until July 4, 1776), that he was critical of

39 *Journals*, August 3, 4, 5, 10, 22, 1776. Muhlenberg records that he used Deuteronomy 20:1-4 and Ephesians 6:10ff. as his texts at these special services. His son Frederick preached for him on one of these occasions and spoke more belligerently on Nehemiah 4:14.

40 *Journals*, September 23, 1777; July 26-30, 1778.

41 *Journals*, February 25, December 9, 1779, etc.

42 *Journals*, December 24, 1777; January 13, February 26, March 30, May 11, June 21, 1778; *et passim*.

American liberty, and that he reproached colonial soldiers for their conduct.⁴³ Muhlenberg's studied neutrality, as far at least as his overt actions and public speech were concerned, exposed him to repeated attacks from both camps.

Again and again Muhlenberg raised the question as to whether he and his Lutheran colleagues ought not to take sides and openly declare their allegiance to Great Britain or their support of independence. But he invariably answered his own question with a categorical No. In spite of the difficulties in which it involved him, he preferred to observe a cautious neutrality. He argued, in the first place, that the fortunes of war are too variable. The ascendant power at any moment or in any place destroys the adherents of the other power. Tories and patriots are like wheels, he said, half of which are now in the mud, now in the air. The outcome of the war is exceedingly dubious. The conclusion depends upon God, for what men prudently desire does not settle the matter. The fate of the church must not be allowed to depend upon one or another outcome. Accordingly, Muhlenberg counseled against renouncing old congregational charters and securing new ones from the revolutionary governments, since a British victory might leave the congregations without any legal standing. Moreover, he hoped that nothing might happen to prevent a resumption of European help for the churches after the war.⁴⁴ In the second place, even if it were expedient to do so, Muhlenberg confessed that he was unable to decide which side, if any, was right. He called it "an unnatural war" and "an extraordinary war patterned after the ancient heathen, barbarian practice." Even those who were engaged in it, he said, did not understand the real causes of the war. Hardly one in one hundred, an officer told Muhlenberg, knew why he fought or did not fight—except that the Negroes seemed to hope for a British victory in order that they might secure their freedom. Certainly it was not a war in which religion was at stake. On the contrary, irreligion on the part of both British and Americans was the real cause of the conflict. War, said Muhlenberg, is an unspeakable tragedy and sin, and doubly so when

43 *Journals*, May 28, 1775; November 3, 12, 24, 1777; *et passim*.

44 German MS. letters, Muhlenberg to Kunze, November 1, 1779; Kunze to Muhlenberg, December 5, 1783; Muhlenberg to the elders and deacons in Ebenezer, Georgia, June 24, 1784. *Journals*, July 23, December 22, 1777; June 4, 1778.

it is waged on Sunday. Singing a *Te Deum* after a military victory is like doing so after a man commits adultery without being caught.⁴⁵ In the third place, Muhlenberg held steadfastly to the view that it was the duty of the church to preach the Gospel and nothing but the Gospel in time of war as in time of peace. Clergymen must limit themselves in their public ministrations and activities to the functions of the church. The Lutheran Ministerium, organized by Muhlenberg in 1748, adhered closely to this policy, for the only reference to the Revolution in its minutes reads: "It was decided how prayers should be offered for the government, and several cases of conscience were also discussed."⁴⁶

Throughout the Revolution Henry Melchior Muhlenberg pursued a thorny path of exceedingly difficult neutrality. But his outward neutrality concealed the conflict and heartbreak within. When the war began he had Tory leanings without being a Tory in the full sense of the word. As the war progressed he seems by almost imperceptible stages, to have become somewhat reconciled to the cause which two of his sons embraced, but his doubts and fears and misgivings were never absent. There is no doubt that the anxieties caused by the war helped to make him a broken, old man, an "*inutile pondus*," a "fifth wheel on a wagon," and "peevish like an old hysterical woman."⁴⁷ But he had already served his church and his country well and earned the retirement which the war as well as his waning strength forced upon him.

45 *Journals*, June 2, 1775; October 23, 27, 1776; June 11, September 20, November 3, December 18, 1777; February 27, May 15, 1778; February 10, 1781.

46 *Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States, 1748-1821*, edited by A. Spaeth, H. E. Jacobs, and G. F. Spieker (Philadelphia, 1898), 154-55.

47 English MS. letter, Muhlenberg to the secretary of the province of Pennsylvania, October 7, 1775; *Journals*, March 7, September 6, 1777.

THE NON-INTRUSION CONTROVERSY IN SCOTLAND, 1832-1943

ARVEL B. ERICKSON

*Cleveland College, Western Reserve University,
Cleveland, Ohio*

The non-intrusion controversy in the Church of Scotland grew out of a demand of the evangelical group in that Church that the intrusion of ministers on unwilling congregations be stopped. The patrons, who had been accused of intruding unsatisfactory ministers on parishes, insisted that the presentee must be accepted by the parish unless valid objections were raised to his theology, literary style, or moral character. On the other hand, the more zealous of the Scottish clergy and laity vehemently insisted that the presentee, in addition to possessing those qualifications, must be personally "acceptable" to the congregation. In fact, many insisted that when the presbytery was moderating in the call, the question of the presentee's "acceptability" outweighed all other considerations.

It is obvious, therefore, that a clear understanding of the use and meaning of the "call" in Presbyterian Scotland is a prerequisite to a proper understanding of this question. When a parish fell vacant —the patron nominated or "presented" to the living. Then the congregation took the presentee on trial, ie., heard him preach, questioned him as to his theological orthodoxy, invited him into their homes and subjected his moral principles to careful examination. Then the presbytery (composed of the ministers of the region together with elders representing the sessions of the churches) decided whether the number of signatures of the call from the congregation was sufficient to entitle it to proceed with the settlement. If the decision was in the affirmative, and the presbytery was satisfied with the literary and theological attainments of the presentee, the call of the congregation was offered to him. If it was accepted by the presentee he was ordained as the minister. But, if the decision was in the negative, did the patron have the right to intrude his presentee

on the unwilling congregation? It was the controversy over this question that was to result in a large secession from the Established Church of Scotland and the formation of the Free Kirk.

While this controversy did not come to a head until the nineteenth century, its roots go back to the time in the sixteenth century when Scotland accepted Calvinism.¹ In fact, the maturing of the nation itself was coincident with the establishment of the Presbyterian Church as the State Church, and the Theocracy² then formed insisted upon complete sovereignty in things it considered purely spiritual. But many refused to accept this claim, and from 1567 it was the subject of much angry disputation. According to Harold Laski, the basic question was: "Can the State tolerate alongside itself churches which avow themselves *societates perfectae*, claiming exemption from its jurisdiction even when, as often enough, they traverse the field over which it ploughs? Is the State but one of many, or are those many but parts of itself, the one?"³ To this question the State gave a negative answer, while, on the other hand, the first General Assembly of the Church accepted the doctrine of the *Societates Perfectae*.

Those who claimed for the Church at least coordinate jurisdiction in determining whether cases appealed to it were spiritual or temporal, and final authority in all matters it considered spiritual, based their claim on the Act of 1592⁴ which had given to the Church powers which were almost divine in the ecclesiastical sphere.⁵ Furthermore, lay patronage—the core of the question as it took shape in 1832-1843—was abolished in 1690 and ministerial appointment was given to the male heads of the families of the congregations.⁶ Of even greater importance, however, the Act of Union (1707) specifically pledged the State to maintain the Acts of 1592 and 1690,

1 P. H. Brown, *History of Scotland* (Cambridge, 1911), III.

2 Preserved Smith, in *The Age of the Reformation* (New York, 1920), 364, describes this Church as a "demoeratic puritanical theocracy," in which the real rulers of the Church, and through it of the State, "were the ministers and elders elected by the people. The demoeracy of the kirk consisted in the rise of most of these men from the lower ranks of the people; its theocracy in the claim of these men . . . to interpret the commands of God."

3 Harold Laski, *The Problem of Sovereignty* (New Haven, 1924), 28.

4 *Acts of Scott. Parl.*, III, 541.

5 Laski, *op. cit.*, 31.

6 *Acts of Scott. Parl.*, IX, 196-197.

and gave its sanction to the Church "with the free knowledge that she held the very principles which she is now [1839] maintaining; and that, by embodying the Confession of Faith in the Revolution Settlement, the State actually became bound to protect the Church of Scotland in asserting the sole Headship of Christ, and her own spiritual independence, which flows from that divine source."⁷ This was the contention of the Church and therefore when Parliament, in 1712,⁸ restored the lay patronage which the Act of 1690 had abolished, the General Assembly vigorously protested.⁹ And, at a later date, Macaulay told the House of Commons that this violation of the Act of Union was responsible for "almost all the dissent now existing in Scotland."¹⁰

After the passage of the Act of 1712, some presentees had been rejected, "solely because of the opposition of the congregation,"¹¹ but as the century progressed matters changed and the leading ecclesiastics objected to admitting the concurrence of the people as an indispensable element in establishing a pastorate. "A cold indifference," says Hanna, "lapsing in not a few instances into doctrinal latitudinarianism, spread through the ministry, generating a very strong antipathy to that popular taste which, whenever it was permitted to exert itself, gave its testimony unequivocally in favor of the purity and warmth by which an evangelical ministry is distin-

7 W. W. Hetherington, *History of the Church of Scotland* (hereinafter cited as *Church of Scot.*), (New York, 1848), 405. "Just as certainly as the Revolution Settlement placed William of Orange on the throne, did it establish the Kirk on a basis of . . . spiritual independence." This was the view of the *Westminster Review*, XL (1843), 195-196.

8 *Statutes at Large*, 10 Anne, C. 12.

9 *Acts of the General Assembly* (1712), 23. William Carstares, Robert Bailie and others sent a vigorous protest to Parliament against the Act of 1712, declaring that the Church of Scotland had always "reckoned patronage a grievance and burden." The Act of 1680, it said, "must be understood to be a part of our Presbyterian Constitution secured to us by the Treaty of Union forever." See *State Papers and Letters Addressed to William Carstares*, App., IV, 796-797. In a letter to Sir James Graham, Thomas Chalmers declared that the Act of 1712, passed with undue speed while the Scottish M.P.'s were absent from Parliament, was the infidel Bolingbroke's way of "punishing the Church and people of Scotland for their adherence to the House of Hanover." Cited in Charles S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham* (hereinafter cited as *Life of Graham*) (London, 1907), I, 380. But both the *Quarterly Review*, LXVII (1840-1841), 249-250, and *Blackwoods Magazine*, XLVI (1839), 580, state that the Act of 1712 was passed because the Act of 1690 had caused only "heats" and dissensions.

10 *Macaulay's Speeches* (New York, 1866), II, 301.

11 W. Hanna, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers* (hereinafter cited as *Memoirs of Chalmers*) (Edinburgh, 1852), III, 344.

guished."¹² Nevertheless, a considerable body clung to the older view of non-intrusion and in some parishes, rather than listen to a minister who had been intruded upon them, many communicants stayed at home, or, in some cases, barricaded the church against the intruder.¹³ Since this was usually a losing game, some of the congregation eventually returned but in sullen silence, indifferent as to what was said and done; others left the Church to swell the ranks of the Dissenters. It was natural, therefore, that the immediate result of the evangelical fervor that gripped Scotland in the early years of the nineteenth century was an attack on patronage. Some, like Thomson of Edinburgh, sought to solve the problem by organizing associations to buy from patrons their rights of presentation. Others joined the Voluntary movement and devoted their labors to the cause of destroying *all* Church Establishments.¹⁴

But as a whole this question of patronage, like so many others, remained dormant during the greater part of the eighteenth century. The Age of Reason produced throughout Scotland, if not actual indifference to things spiritual, at least a very large degree of moderatism¹⁵ in which "secular principles [and] cold legal and moral preaching, and uncensored immorality" held sway.¹⁶ More and more did the Scottish clergy come to regard Christianity as "merely an improved system of morality" and consequently their sermons became little more than "coldly plausible moral essays."¹⁷ Zeal gave way to indifference, and the deep and earnest spirit of a vital, personal religion based on the acceptance of the atonement and Christ's continuing presence, almost disappeared. Control of the General Assembly fell completely into the hands of the Moderates and for more than three quarters of a century the "Reign of the Moderates" was absolute.¹⁸

12 *Ibid.* Allowance must be made for the evangelical bias of Hanna.

13 Hetherington, *Church of Scot.*, 363 et. seq.; Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, III, 347-348.

14 Such as the Voluntary Church Association of Edinburgh.

15 See A. P. Stanley, *History of the Church of Scotland* (New York, 1872).

16 Hetherington, *Church of Scot.*, 355.

17 *Ibid.*, 357.

18 The patronage question was never entirely forgotten nor ignored. Men like Erskine, Hunter, and Hardy often denounced patronage as a grievous burden. The latter, in 1784, wrote a pamphlet in which he charged that patronage was "irreconcilable with the genius of Presbytery." Cited in Hetherington, *Church of Scot.*, 375.

When Moderatism arose it corresponded to the dominant note of the age. But by the early years of the nineteenth century another note was gaining the ascendancy, and zeal rather than moderation was its watchword. One need not sympathize with the theological narrowness, or with the emotional expressions of their religious fervor, in order to appreciate the tenacity with which many now clung to a religious conviction that gave purpose, meaning and direction to their lives. And this evangelicalism was well-calculated to appeal to the Scottish character which, on points of conscience and religious scruples, was now returning to the spirit of the old Covenanters.¹⁹ The leaders in the Church were no longer Moderates, but Evangelicals such as Wellwood, Thomson, and Chalmers—men who were keenly interested in the task of saving souls.²⁰ It was in the interest of such evangelicalism that Andrew Thomson began, in 1810, the publication of the *Christian Instructor*, a magazine which did for the Evangelicals what the *Edinburgh Review* did for the Whigs. Then, in 1825, he organized an anti-patronage society.²¹ In the same spirit and interest, the General Assembly of 1817 passed an act against the non-residence of ministers.²² In 1831 the Assembly deposed Campbell of Row, and four years later Edward Irving, for teaching heresies which were in themselves “a proof of the quickened religious feeling of the time.”²³

The year that was to become notable in English History as the year of the Great Reform Bill was destined to become equally notable in Scotland for the commencement of the final stage in the non-intrusion controversy.²⁴ No sooner had

19 *Annual Register* (London, 1843), 240 et. seq.; Duke of Argyll, *Autobiography and Memoirs* (hereinafter cited as *Memoirs*), (London, 1906), I, 88-89.

20 Brown, *Hist. of Scot.*, III, 424.

21 Hetherington, *Church of Scot.*, 396. The *Quarterly Review*, LXVII (1840-41), 205, said the society accomplished nothing and that the announcement of its organization was greeted with a “mingled feeling of pity and surprise.”

22 *Acts of Ass.*, (1817), 15.

23 *Ibid.*, (1831); (1835); Brown, *Hist. of Scot.*, III, 424. Campbell of Row, for instance, had been preaching the heretical doctrine of universal redemption. See Hetherington, *Church of Scot.*, 391.

24 While it is true that the Reform Bill of 1832, giving the franchise to thousands who had not formerly had it, led some to reason that if they should have a voice in the selection of M. P.'s they should also have the determining voice in the selection of their spiritual guides, it had, as a matter of fact, very little effect on this non-intrusion struggle. What the Reform Bill did was to give such an impulse to the public mind, sending it into every channel of thought, that henceforth no institution, civil or sacred, “could be long in a state of safety, which could not stand the most searching scrutiny.” Hether-

Chalmers, the Moderator, called the Assembly of 1832 together, than eight presbyteries and three synods placed on the table an Overture begging the Assembly to terminate the settlement of unacceptable ministers.²⁵ This Overture was based on the conviction of the Evangelicals that the forcing of ministers on unwilling congregations had "alienated the people, corrupted a large proportion of the ministers, diminished her [the Church's] usefulness, and weakened her influence over the public mind."²⁶ But the Moderates, still in control of the Assembly, carried a counter-resolution by a majority of forty-five votes. The issue was therefore clearly joined, and a bitter and acrimonious ten year struggle inaugurated.

When this overture was rejected, the Evangelicals went to work with remarkable energy and enthusiasm, determined to carry their cause at the next meeting of the Assembly.²⁷ Their efforts were crowned with success, too, for the most important subject discussed at the Assembly of 1833 was Chalmers' motion that the dissent of a majority, with or without the assignment of reasons, should set aside the presentee.²⁸ This motion was defeated by only twelve votes,²⁹ whereas the Overture of the previous year had been beaten by a majority of forty-five. This was the last victory the Moderates were ever to gain in the Assembly, and the victory was dearly bought for it resulted in a quickening of the Evangelicals' conviction that the non-intrusion question was one that concerned the clergy

ington, *Church of Scot.*, 391. Most of the Evangelical leaders were conservatives and were opposed to the Reform Bill. See Chalmers' letter to Graham in W. Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, III, 405. The *Quart. Rev.*, LXVII (1840-41), 205, attributed the opening of the non-intrusion controversy in 1832 to the "feverish longing for innovation," engendered by the Reform Bill. In 1839 Chalmers wrote to Graham: "This is in no sense a political question." Cited in Frances Balfour, *Life of George, Fourth Earl of Aberdeen* (hereinafter cited as *Life of Aberdeen*) (London, 1922), II, 49.

25 *Acts of Assembly*, (1832), 41-42.

26 Hetherington, *Church of Scot.*, 396.

27 To the popular, i. e. evangelical party, this was not a social, economic, or political question but a religious one. "There is one principle," wrote Chalmers to C. Grant, in 1833, "Which I think the Church must firmly abide by, and that is its own ultimate power of deciding . . . whether . . . it is for the Christian good of the population of that parish that presentation shall be sustained." Cited in Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, III, 351.

28 *Acts of Ass.*, (1833), 45-46.

29 *Ibid.* Henry Cockburn considered this victory of the Moderates an actual defeat because if the motion had carried, "it would have deprived the anti-patronage case of its growing strength, by satisfying the claims of the people." Henry Cockburn, *Journal* (Edinburgh, 1874), 44-45.

and Christian society and therefore a question "with which the Aristocracy [patrons] have no spiritual right to intermeddle."³⁰

The question was brought up again as soon as the Assembly met in 1834, and the motion, this time made by Lord Moncrieff, was carried by a majority of forty-six. The motion declared that "no Pastor shall be intruded on any Congregation contrary to the will of the people."³¹ An accompanying measure providing for carrying the Act into effect and stipulating precisely how calls were to be made was likewise passed.³² Although those who framed the Veto Act, as this Act of 1834 came to be called, no doubt intended it as a "final and pacifying measure"³³ and sincerely hoped that it would settle the question,³⁴ it was now obvious to all that the Evangelicals at last had the upper hand and that the days of unrestricted patronage were numbered. That the Evangelicals had clearly won the day was further demonstrated by the passage in the same year of the Chapels of Ease Act.³⁵ This dealt with the *quoad sacra* parishes, i.e. those parishes that had recently been created and in which the ministers had not yet been admitted to full ministerial privileges.³⁶ In the eyes of the Evangelicals this was an injustice to the men who were their spiritual colleagues, and the Chapel Act which removed these disabilities was passed by the same majority by which the Veto Act had been passed.

30 *Westminster Review*, XL (1843), 199.

31 The difference between this Act and the one of 1833 was that it specifically stipulated that no one could vote in the call of a minister unless he first declared himself to be actuated by "no factious or malicious motives." *Acts of Ass.*, (1834), 31. The hostile *Quart. Rev.*, LXVII (1840-41), 213, regarded this as an "awkward" remedy because "the onus of establishing the corrupt motive of the objectors was here thrown on the patron, the presentee, or the minority."

In the debate on this Act, Cook, the leader of the Moderates, admitted, though perhaps inadvertently, that qualification for a ministerial call included learning, sound theology, moral character, and "acceptability" to the congregation. This was an important concession to the Evangelicals because since the days of Principal Robertson the Moderates had strenuously denied that the call was based on anything other than learning, moral character, and sound theology.

32 *Acts of Ass.*, (1834), 32-36.

33 Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, III, 361; *Quart. Rev.*, LXVII (1840-41), 206.

34 It was hoped that by this "constitutional limitation of patronage" the campaign against all Establishments could be checked. See Hetherington, *Church of Scot.*, 397. Cockburn records in his *Journal* (I, 58, April 4, 1834), that there was now "an alarming spirit of opposition to the Establishment." In Glasgow, he asserted, 40,000 people had petitioned Parliament in the interest of the Voluntary Church system.

35 *Acts of Ass.*, (1834), 27-28.

36 For instance, to sit in Church courts.

The Veto Act, by depriving the patron of his statutory right to have his candidate taken on trial, and if qualified, accepted, made intrusion impossible. It declared the dissent of the congregation with or without reasons, final and conclusive, and, as the *Quarterly Review* complained, it converted "the right of the patron to *present* into a mere right to *propose*."³⁷ But was the General Assembly competent to so decide? Did it possess the authority to pass an act which, by depriving the patrons of their statutory rights, set aside the Act of 1712? Lord Brougham thought so;³⁸ the Crown Lawyers of the day, believing that the Act was consistent with the legally recognized constitution of the Church, approved; the clergy, basing their attitude on the Act of 1690, certainly believed that the Veto Act was not *ultra vires* of the Assembly.

But this question of legality was soon settled, for within three months of the passage of the Veto Act a test case was brought before the courts. In August, 1834, Lord Kinnoul nominated Robert Young to the living of Auchterarder in Perthshire. When the day of decision came, the call was signed by but two persons and the patron's factor while 287 out of a membership of 330 refused to accept him.³⁹ The presbytery upheld the congregation and refused to sustain the call. The presentee promptly appealed to the synod and when this body affirmed the decision of the presbytery the presentee appealed to the General Assembly. On the motion of Lord Moncrieff the Assembly rejected the appeal of Young by a vote

37 *Quart. Rev.*, LXVII (1840-1841), 211. The Veto Act reads as follows: "It is the fundamental law of this Church, that no pastor shall be intruded on any congregation contrary to the will of the people; and, . . . it shall be an instruction to Presbyteries, that if, at the moderating in a call to a vacant pastoral charge, the major part of the male heads of families, members of the vacant congregation, and in full communion with the Church, shall disapprove of the person in whose favor the call is proposed to be moderated in, such disapproval shall be deemed sufficient ground for the Presbytery rejecting such person, and that he shall be rejected accordingly, and due notice thereof forthwith given to all concerned; but that, if the major part of the said heads of families shall not disapprove of such person to be their pastor, the Presbytery shall proceed with the settlement according to the rules of the Church: And further declare that no person shall be held to be entitled to disapprove as aforesaid, who shall refuse, if required, solemnly to declare, in presence of the Presbytery, that he is actuated by no factious or malicious motive, but solely by a conscientious regard to the spiritual interest of himself or the congregation." Quoted in Hetherington, *Church of Scot.*, App., 491.

38 He was later to reverse his opinion.

39 The objection was to neither his character nor his conduct but to the "feebleness" of his preaching as well as to some physical deformities. See Brown, *Hist. of Scot.*, III, 427; Balfour, *Life of Aberdeen*, II, 47.

of 131 to 91.⁴⁰ In behalf of his presentee Lord Kinnoul then raised an action in the Court of Session against the Presbytery of Auchterarder, maintaining that according to the statute the power of the presbytery was limited to the matter of qualification.⁴¹ By an eight to five vote this court decided that the Veto Act was contrary to the Statute of 1712 and that the Assembly had acted illegally. In announcing the decision, the president of the Court of Session declared that the Presbyterian claim that Jesus and not Parliament was the sole head of the Church in any temporal, legislative, or judicial sense, was a complete absurdity.⁴² On the other hand, the contention of the Church was put very succinctly by Sir James Graham who declared that the Church of Scotland "acknowledged the right of no authority to interfere with their ecclesiastical government. They recognize not the Sovereign of these realms as the head of their Church."⁴³ At a lecture in London, in 1838, Chalmers publicly announced that the Presbyterians owned "no head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ," and that it was "amenable to no higher power on earth."⁴⁴ The General Assembly took the same high ground declaring that in matters of doctrine, government, and discipline, "her judicatories possess an exclusive jurisdiction founded on the Word of God, which power ecclesiastical . . . flows immediately from God and the Mediator Jesus Christ, and is spiritual, not having a temporal head on earth, but only Christ, the only King and Governor of his Kirk."⁴⁵

The Court of Session had actually decided that the presentee's right to be taken on trial, regardless of the wishes of the congregation, and if found qualified, to be admitted was a civil and not an ecclesiastical right. It followed, therefore, that the obligation of the presbytery to try him and if he was found satisfactory to admit and ordain him was a civil obligation;⁴⁶ and the Presbytery of Auchterarder, having rejected Young without assigning reasons, had violated the Statute of

40 *Acts of Ass.*, (1835), 68-69.

41 The Assembly of 1836 voted the necessary funds for defraying the costs of the defense of the Auchterarder presbytery. *Ibid.*, 64-65.

42 Cited in E. L. Woodward, *The Age of Reform* (Oxford, 1938), 508.

43 Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates* (hereinafter cited as *Hansard*), new ser., XXXV, 581.

44 Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, IV, 45.

45 *Acts of Ass.*, (1838), 29.

46 The Evangelicals held that one who had received a call had no right to act until after his ordination.

1712. But the General Assembly refused to recognize the Court of Session as a superior court and the case was therefore taken to the "Laodicean atmosphere of the House of Lords."⁴⁷ Founding their judgment on the principle that church courts could reject a presentee only because he was not qualified in a literary, doctrinal, or moral way—a principle that even the Moderates had rejected in 1833—the Lords affirmed the decision of the Court of Session in favor of Lord Kinnoul and his presentee.⁴⁸ This meant, as the *Westminster Review* pointed out, that the clergy were "bound to *ordain* at the bidding of the civil courts."⁴⁹

What was the response to this decision? The Evangelicals felt that their church "had been sacrificed to English prejudices."⁵⁰ and complained that the decision left them little check on the abuse of patronage because it bound them to induct a presentee unless he were objected to on cause shown, rather than merely on his "unacceptableness." Legally, therefore, the call was now a mere mockery.⁵¹ The Moderates, on the other hand, were overjoyed that the High Court had decided in their favor,⁵² while the Dissenters, if the testimony of Henry Cockburn be accepted, were equally pleased because it would make numerous converts to their cause.⁵³

It was in anything but a conciliatory mood, therefore, that the Assembly of 1839 began consideration of the two motions that were immediately introduced—one by the Moderate, Cook; the other by the Evangelical, Chalmers. Both men recognized the principle of non-intrusion and of fitness but while Cook's motion proposed to leave to the Church the *effect* of the objections, Chalmers' motion made rejection by the Church, on the ground of those objections, imperative. Chalmers' motion was easily carried.⁵⁴

47 Balfour, *Life of Aberdeen*. II, 48.

48 Hetherington, *Church of Scot.*, 404.

49 *Westminster Review*, XL, (1843), 199-200. The article further stated that many people now left the Church because the decision of the Lords "forbade them to obey in their spiritual procedure the Lord Jesus Christ—and commanded them to obey the Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst."

50 Cockburn, *Journal*, I, 226.

51 *Ibid.*, 167.

52 Some Moderates were disappointed because all they had gotten was an affirmation of their principle.

53 Cockburn was worried over the future of the Church. It appeared to him that "Its buttresses are falling every hour." See his *Journal*, I, 169.

54 *Acts of Ass.*, (1839), 39. The vote was 204-155.

During these years the country had been kept in a constant turmoil by other cases of rejected presentees. The most famous of these was that of Marnock in the Presbytery of Strathbogie in Aberdeenshire.⁵⁵ In 1837 the Earl of Fife, patron of the parish, presented Edwards to the living, but since only one of the 300 communicants signed the call, the presbytery, on instructions from the General Assembly, rejected the presentee. Encouraged by the Auchterarder decision, the presentee carried his case to the Court of Session which decided that the presbytery must accept Edwards. This left the presbytery in a quandary—was it to act in accordance with instructions from the Assembly or in keeping with the decision of the Court of Sessions? By a vote of seven to four, it was decided to do the latter, and this action was bitterly denounced by the partisans of the Veto Act.⁵⁶ The General Assembly wasted no time in deciding that Edwards could not serve the church and in suspending the seven ministers who voted to obey the Court of Session instead of the Assembly.⁵⁷ Those who opposed this action did so because they thought it both despotic and illegal, while those who approved applauded the statement of Robert Candlish that the Assembly intended "at all hazards to maintain the authority of her jurisdiction against the encroachments of the civil arm . . . and to assert the authority of her government and discipline as paramount alike over the power of the patron and the privileges of the people."⁵⁸

The General Assembly having immediately replaced the deposed seven,⁵⁹ there were now two presbyteries in Strathbogie, one taking orders from the Assembly, the other from the Court of Session. The latter, legally competent to decide on the use of church property, interdicted the minority from using the churches, church-yards, or school-houses, and the Evangelicals were therefore forced to take to homes, barns, and open fields for their services. But it was of no avail to exclude the Non-Intrusionist ministers from the churches unless they could be prevented from continuing their clerical functions; hence

55 For a detailed account of this case see Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, IV, 140 et. seq.

56 This was a strongly "moderate" parish.

57 *Acts of Ass.*, (1839), 58.

58 Robert Buchanan, *The Ten Years Conflict* (Glasgow, 1859), II, 33. The edict of suspension was carried by a vote of 121 to 14.

59 *Acts of Ass.*, (1840), 27.

the seven deposed ministers applied to the Court of Session for a second interdict. This time the Court decided to issue warrants to the deposed seven enabling them to preach where the General Assembly had said they could not. This decision was never given effect, however, for the deposed seven, recognizing that discretion was the better part of valor, refrained from using the churches or church-properties.

When this situation came under the consideration of the Commission of Assembly in 1840, Chalmers voiced the majority opinion in his declaration that the Non-Intrusionists would not recede one inch. "They may force the ejection of us from our places," he said, but "they shall never, never force us to the surrender of our principles."⁶⁰ It was in this spirit that the Assembly adopted by the record vote of 107 to 9 a series of resolutions which declared that the interdict of the Court of Session was contrary to the liberties of their Church; that the Court of Session, because of its decision in the Auchterarder case, was responsible for the ensuing civil encroachments; that Parliament ought to adopt measures to protect the Church from further encroachments.⁶¹

By 1840, then, the issue could be clearly defined along the following lines. The ordination of ministers, and judging as to the qualifications of such ministers, were obviously spiritual functions. On the other hand, the enjoyment of a benefice was just as obviously a secular one. Consequently, as the Duke of Argyll pointed out, "if the two were inseparable, then either the civil courts must coerce the Church in the function of ordination, or else the Church could abolish the statutory right of patronage in parochial benefices."⁶² The statute of 1712 had solved this problem by enacting that the Church naturally forfeited the rights to endowments if it refused to take a qualified presentee. But the civil courts,

60 Buchanan, *Ten Years Conflict*, II, 50.

61 *Acts of Ass.*, (1840), 69.

The fact that the Moderates could muster only nine votes against these resolutions is partly due to the fact that since they came for the most part from the rural areas not so many could attend the Assembly meetings. In addition, however, they were not very zealous in their own cause. While something like 180,000 males over sixteen years of age had petitioned Parliament in the non-intrusion cause, only 1200 Moderates had done so. See Buchanan, *Ten Years Conflict*, II, 53. It must be remembered, of course, that petitioning Parliament was much more difficult for the Moderates because they lived in rural regions where it is always difficult to obtain concerted action.

62 Argyll, *Memoirs*, I, 166.

adhering to the theory of the inseparability of the cure and the benefice, were now asserting their supremacy over both, and were presuming to order the Church in the purely spiritual function of ordination. Since this was precisely what the Church Assembly was vehemently denouncing, some change in the civil law of patronage was essential if a dissolution of the Established Church was to be prevented. To obtain legislation for this purpose the Assembly sent a deputation to London to interview the spokesmen for the Government and for the Opposition.⁶³

As if to prepare these leaders for their coming, the members of the deputation wrote to the most influential of them explaining the position the Non-Intrusionists had taken. Typical of these letters was the one sent by Chalmers to his friend Sir James Graham who was Peel's chief associate in the Conservative party and who would unquestionably hold one of the leading positions in the Conservative cabinet when the government of Melbourne was voted out of office. Chalmers made it clear that unless some salutary legislation was passed to end the evil of patronage, "very many" of the leaders of the Church were "resolved to quit the Establishment." Knowing Graham's continuous fears for the stability of the social order Chalmers cleverly reminded him that such action by the leaders of the Church would strip it of moral weight and "leave it a prey for the Radicals, and Voluntaries, and demi-infidels." On the other hand, he could rest assured, wrote Chalmers, that "conservatism has nothing to fear, but everything to hope, from giving the people a greater interest and share than heretofore in their Church and clergy." In conclusion, he promised Graham (and, as Graham was fully aware, it was no idle promise), that the clergy would attach the masses to the Establishment and so secure peace and order.⁶⁴

Arrived in London, the deputation, which had divided into smaller groups, interviewed the leading men in both parties. It was Chalmers' lot to interview Melbourne, Peel, Graham, and Aberdeen. His interview with Melbourne was a complete

⁶³ The deputation was headed by Chalmers, Bruce, Gordon, Candlish, Muir, and Smythe, the leaders of the Church. Although they suspected that their errand would be unfruitful, they clung to the slender hope that some concessions would be gained from either the Whigs or the Conservatives because an election was not far off and both parties would no doubt like to have the clerical influence on their side. See Cockburn, *Journal*, I, 235.

⁶⁴ Cited in Parker, *Life of Graham*, I, 373-374.

failure, and Chalmers notes in his *Journal* that "such a feckless and fushionless entertainment of the matter on the part of his Lordship, I never witnessed in my life."⁶⁵ In fact, Melbourne's performance was so bad that the usually austere Chalmers could scarcely suppress a loud guffaw. Peel, on the other hand, was "very bland" and of "extreme caution and coldness"—so much so that it "damped" Chalmers' spirits. Graham, he found "fine, hearty, honest," and a man of "great good feeling and practical sense,"⁶⁶ while Aberdeen, though friendly, "refused to pledge himself."⁶⁷

Since other members of the deputation had the same experience, the London mission accomplished nothing tangible. But it is difficult to see how it could have secured any pledges of help for the Church. Melbourne was in office but the Whig party was powerless. Furthermore, as Melbourne himself admitted, he was "utterly ignorant" of the Church question,⁶⁸ and as usual preferred to "let it alone." Moreover, he could not bring himself to take the part of any institution opposing the law of the land; nor could he agree to anything which would "place the election of ministers more in the hands of the Congregations than it is at present."⁶⁹ Brougham, likewise, would make no concessions to the Church lest the result would be to "end all Church Establishments."⁷⁰

But while the Whigs would not promise to abolish patronage, neither would the Conservatives. The Non-Intrusionists, to be sure, had always looked upon them as their chief hope,⁷¹ but it is doubtful that they really believed any aid would come from that source since the Conservatives, if they stood for anything, stood for the rigid enforcement of the law. And, from a legal point of view, the issue was now very clear to them.⁷² While they and the Whigs held to the absolute supremacy of the law as interpreted by the courts, the Non-Intrusionists now frequently spoke of a "higher law" than the constitution and openly declared that if the civil law and the law of God conflicted, they owed first allegiance to God. In

65 Cited in Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, IV, 120.

66 Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, IV, 120; 121.

67 Balfour, *Life of Aberdeen*, II, 49.

68 Cited in *Lord Melbourne's Papers*, Lloyd Sanders, ed. (London, 1889), 416.

69 *Ibid.*

70 *Hansard*, 3d. ser., LIV, 362.

71 Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, IV, 120.

72 Commenting on the Lords' decision, Brougham declared he "had never seen a clearer case. It seemed to be all one way." *Hansard*, 3d. ser., L, 374.

all civil matters connected with their Church they gladly agreed that the civil law was supreme and promised to obey it to the letter, but they flatly refused to allow any State agency to interfere with the Church's spiritual and ecclesiastical rights.⁷³ The question, then, was whether the principle of non-intrusion was an ecclesiastical or a secular one. To Whigs and Conservatives it was the latter; to the Non-Intrusionists, the former.

Obtaining no satisfaction from the harassed Melbourne or the crafty Russell; knowing the Erastianism of Peel; having heard that no help would come from Graham;⁷⁴ the Non-Intrusion committee turned once again to Aberdeen who had had personal experience as a patron whose presentee had been rejected⁷⁵ and who was considered the least antagonistic of the opponents of the Scottish Church. After giving careful thought to the subject, and definitely ascertaining that Melbourne would do nothing,⁷⁶ Aberdeen introduced a Bill which he hoped would be the salve for these ecclesiastical sores.⁷⁷ The chief feature of this Bill was the provision for a presbyterial veto, i.e. the presbytery was to be competent to decide upon objections to a nominee, if such objections were made in specific terms. In presenting the Bill, Aberdeen professed that he did not believe in "the exercise of an arbitrary, capricious, and groundless will of a congregation without assigned reasons."⁷⁸ The Bill met with generous support in the House of Lords, but the General Assembly immediately rejected it.⁷⁹

73 See speech of Sir G. Clerk in the House of Commons. *Hansard*, 3d. ser., XXXV, 574-576.

74 Graham to Chalmers, in Parker, *Life of Graham*, I, 378-379.

75 Balfour, *Life of Aberdeen*, II, 57-58.

76 *Hansard*, 3d. ser., LVI, 137-138.

77 *Ibid.*, LIII, 1209-1229.

78 *Hansard*, 3d. ser., LIII, 1218.

79 *Acts of Ass.*, (1841), 41-42. The vote was 230 to 105. Aberdeen knew, or at least should have known, that his Bill would be repudiated by the Assembly for the Non-Intrusion committee had written to him on May 2, 1840, that a law founded on his scheme would merely substitute the will of the presbytery for the will of the people. When he replied that the people might reject a presentee merely because he had red hair, the committee answered that if the congregation considered the presentee "unacceptable" for that reason, the objection was valid. Not one of the Non-Intrusionists would accept the requirement that congregations assign reasons for their dissent. See Buchanan, *Ten Years Conflict*, II, 76 et. seq. The *Quart. Rev.*, LXVII (1840-41), 233, asserted that the Assembly rejected the Bill because it would have quashed the agitation for total abolition of patronage. John Tron of Edinburgh, defending the Bill in the Assembly, stated that he had no objections to a congregation rejecting a presentee because he had an offensive accent or wrong-colored hair, but what if they rejected him because he was too godly, too upright, too zealous in the Master's cause? Hadn't the Apostle

One of the reasons for this rejection, as Aberdeen had been told, was that it disallowed the dissent of the people and required the church courts to admit and ordain a presentee despite such dissent, unless the *reasons* given by the people to support their dissent were clearly stated, and were such as to justify the rejection. Furthermore, the Assembly declared that a presbyterial veto was no object devoutly to be wished because that body was often as tyrannical as the patrons. In addition, since it excluded dissent without reasons assigned, the Bill was consistent with the Lords' decision in the Auchterarder case and therefore left the now despised Court of Session free to continue its offensive course, and to this the Assembly was adamant in its opposition.

On June 16, the second reading of Aberdeen's Bill was passed by a majority of forty-seven, but the opposition from Scotland was so great that on July 10 its sponsor withdrew it altogether. He assigned three reasons for doing so: first, Melbourne opposed it as a violation of the right of patronage;⁸⁰ secondly, the General Assembly had rejected it as "an attempt to dethrone the Redeemer from His seat;" third, it had now become obvious that the *real* object of the Non-Intrusionists was the total abolition of patronage, and since his Bill did not satisfy them on this ground it was useless to proceed with it.⁸¹

One more effort was made to reach a settlement. The Duke of Argyll proposed a Bill⁸² which would give the right of objection to all the male members of the congregation and was therefore more democratic than the Veto Law itself which had given it solely to the male heads of families. On the other hand, it gave the presbytery the right to over-rule the

Paul declared that a time would come when man would reject sound doctrine? It was just such unsound doctrine, answered the Evangelicals, that intruded ministers had been preaching to unwilling congregations.

80 *The Quart. Rev.*, LXVII (1840-41), 233, praised the Bill highly and suggested that the patrons, not the Assembly, should have opposed it because it provided that the objections of even a single communicant were to receive effect. It thought the Bill left too much power to the presbyteries. "We feel no surprise," it said, "that Government should not have supported Lord Aberdeen's Bill. . . . They opposed it because it went too far rather than not far enough."

81 *Hansard*, 3d. ser., LVI, 1207-1210. By July 10 about 265,000 had petitioned Parliament against the Bill, and only 4000 in favor of it. See Buchanan, *Ten Years Conflict*, II, 121.

82 *Hansard*, 3d. ser., LVII, 1478.

objections of the people if these appeared to rise from factious motives. Since this Bill seemed to harmonize the civil law regarding benefices with the ecclesiastical law regarding the cure of souls,⁸³ the General Assembly approved it by a large majority, but the Conservative Government, having just come into office and not having decided exactly what line to follow, refused to accept it.⁸⁴

Meanwhile the situation in Scotland was becoming more critical. In the summer of 1840 the Non-Intrusionists organized a league called the "Evangelical Covenant" to counter the efforts of the "Moderate League" which had just been formed. The battle cry of the covenanters was non-intrusion or dissolution. In the same year the Chair of Theology at the University of Glasgow fell vacant, and Chalmers, by general agreement, was the logical choice for the post. But to the amazement of many, Graham, Lord Rector of the University, made a special trip to Glasgow to oppose the election of his former friend. This unexpected and wholly unusual procedure, together with Peel's speech in the House of Commons accusing the Evangelicals of openly defying the law,⁸⁵ plus the withdrawal of Aberdeen's Bill and the failure of Argyll's, showed unmistakably where the Conservatives stood. But the Non-Intrusionists acted with equal celerity. The Assembly of 1842 immediately passed two resolutions. The first condemned patronage as a grievance and as unscriptural although it was found easier to argue the former than prove the latter.⁸⁶ The second was a resolution to petition both Parliament and the Queen.⁸⁷ Then the Assembly adopted the famous "Declaration, Claim, and Protest."⁸⁸ This document traced the question at issue from its inception, re-stated the unconstitutional proceedings of the Court of Session, and concluded that the invasions of the State into the spiritual realm had been such that "the Church of

83 This was the view of Fox Maule. See *Hansard*, 3d. ser., LV, 1060 et. seq.

84 The Duke of Argyll blames Aberdeen for the Government's rejection of the Bill. He asserts that Aberdeen was greatly influenced by John Hope, Dean of Faculty, one of the leaders of the Moderates in the Assembly and a bitter opponent of non-intrusion. His pamphlet denouncing the Non-Intrusionists claim of coordinate jurisdiction was very widely read. Argyll, *Memoirs*, I, 178.

85 *Hansard*, 3d. ser., LV, 1058-1060. The same stand was taken by the *Quart. Rev.*, LXVII (1840-41), 226.

86 This difficulty was clearly pointed out in *Blackwoods*, XLVI, (1839) 587 et. seq.

87 *Acts of Ass.*, (1842), 25; 62.

88 *Ibid.*, 35-48.

Scotland had ceased to be a Church of Christ."⁸⁹ Convinced that the Government would undoubtedly meet their petition with a decided negative, positive steps were taken to meet the situation. After they had covenanted together to secede from the Church if the Government did not abolish patronage, they organized committees to collect money, supplies, etc., for financing their own churches if secession had to come.⁹⁰

After carefully studying the "Claim and Protest," Graham, the Home Secretary, sent the Government's answer to the Moderator of the Church.⁹¹ The letter, which was skillfully written, stated positively that the Government would not abolish patronage, would not give a popular veto, but would accept a "judicially used" presbyterial veto.⁹² Since this was precisely the position taken by Aberdeen, a position from which the Evangelicals had already dissented, their answer to the Government declaration was immediate and decisive. They denounced it as extremely Erastian and resolutely denied Graham's insistence that all questions of jurisdiction had to be decided in the law courts. Hetherington thought Graham's letter the work of "a galled partisan, rather than the grave and deliberate thought of a wise statesman."⁹³ Hanna condemned Graham for having taken advantage of the fact that the Assembly had sent two addresses to the Crown, one praying for the abolition of patronage, the other for the spiritual independence of the Church and "mixed the two together, giving one answer to both, to the inevitable and injurious confounding of topics which the Church had been at so much pains to keep distinct."⁹⁴ He denied Graham's charge that the Claim and Protest was comparable to Papal pretensions and maintained that the Church

89 Brown, *Hist. of Scot.*, 430.

90 Cockburn states that the Moderates had told the Government that if it remained firm there would be no secession because the Scottish clergy would not willingly surrender their benefices. That the Government could actually believe that the Evangelicals would not do as they had threatened was almost incomprehensible to Cockburn. He also declared that the 357 ministers, (out of the 427 at the meeting), who had pledged themselves to secede, "contain the whole chivalry of the Church." *Journal*, I, 337.

91 The letter was first published in the *London Times*, Jan. 14, 1843. It is given in full in the *Annual Register* (1843), App. P., 463-470.

92 Cockburn insists that Aberdeen was the author of the letter. But, while the ideas may have been Aberdeen's, the language and phraseology are probably Graham's.

93 Hetherington, *Church of Scot.*, 454.

94 Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, IV, 321. If this charge be sound, it would tend to prove that Graham was the author because in that type of composition Graham was a master with few equals and no superiors—save possibly Gladstone.

of Scotland took a position midway between that of the Erastian State and the Catholic church. The *Westminster Review* excoriated Graham⁹⁵ for logic-chopping when "he ought to have warded off a great national calamity." It went on to assert that the Church ought to have known better than to have expected "from men [Graham and Aberdeen] of aristocratic principles and passions, concessions to ecclesiastical democracy," and from a cabinet composed of men who possessed a "double hatred to what we call evangelical democracy." The result, it concluded, was that "the life has fled from the Kirk. The spirit of John Knox has left it."⁹⁶ Fox Maule, an eminent Scottish M. P., also took up arms against Graham. He insisted that the Church courts had an equal right with the Court of Session in deciding the limits between civil and ecclesiastical functions in cases brought before it.⁹⁷

But while Graham and his letter were bitterly denounced by some, they were highly praised by others. The conservative *Fraser's Magazine* described the letter as

a State-paper . . . which, for lucid analysis, kind and conciliatory feeling . . . and closeness of thought, . . . will be treasured up in the archives of England. . . . This document, so decisive on the supremacy of the law, as becomes its author and his office . . . exterminates quietly, but most triumphantly, the ridiculous pretenses of the Non-Intrusionists.⁹⁸

Similar praise came from the *Morning Chronicle*⁹⁹ as well as from Graham's friends and associates.¹⁰⁰

After disposing of the question of the *quoad sacra* ministers,¹⁰¹ the General Assembly of 1843 adopted a series of resolutions which pointed out the basis of their disagreement with the Government's position, and then for the last time petitioned Parliament. This petition was presented to the House of Commons by Fox Maule who asked for a committee

95 The *West. Rev.*, had turned against Graham in 1834 when he, together with Richmond, Ripon, and Stanley, left the Whig party.

96 *West. Rev.*, XL, 205 et. seq.

97 *Hansard*, 3d. ser., LXVII, 357.

98 *Frazers*, XXVII (1843), 366-367.

99 *Morning Chronicle* (London), Feb. 24, 1843.

100 See Cockburn, *Journal*, I, 338-339; Parker, *Life of Graham*, I, 389-390.

101 The Court of Session had decided that these ministers were not entitled to full ministerial privileges. In keeping with that decision Cook, the leader of the Moderates in the Assembly, moved that their names be stricken from the roll of the commission. But this motion was defeated by a vote of 115 to 23. See Buchanan, *Ten Years Conflict*, II, 414-415.

of the whole house to consider the petition. A long debate ensued in which Peel and Graham, denouncing the Church's claim to equality in jurisdiction as "unjust and unreasonable,"¹⁰² refused to deviate from the position they had taken in Graham's letter.

The State having met the Church's claims and petitions with a decided negative, dissolution was inevitable and immediate, and with the passage of the Act of Separation and Demission, on May 23, 1843, the ecclesiastical revolution was accomplished.¹⁰³ On that day four hundred and seventy clergymen withdrew from the Established Church, leaving their manse and stipends just as they had vowed to do. Many of the congregations left with their pastors and the secession was soon constituted into a body which called itself the Free Church of Scotland. This Free Kirk immediately took the lead among Presbyterian Dissenters and within four years of the disruption, despite the fact that times were unusually hard, it had raised £1,254,000, had built 654 churches, and had organized, on a national scale, a system of schools and theological colleges that rivalled those of the Established Church. On its side, the Government finished its work by passing the Aberdeen Bill "enslaving the people," as the Non-Intrusionists put it, to the presbytery and it to the Court of Session,¹⁰⁴ and Graham's Bill on the endowment of *quoad sacra* parishes excluding the ministers of these parishes from participation in church government. Hence the Government succeeded in establishing the supremacy of the civil arm over the ecclesiastical.

The disruption of the Established Church of Scotland was inevitable from the moment a quickened evangelical fervor made itself felt in Scotland, for a good deal of "the same stubborn and indomitable spirit which worked in the minds of the old

102 Hansard, 3d. ser., LXVII, 394 et. seq. Buchanan is very critical of the House in this instance, caustically commenting that only half the House was present while a debate on a mere railroad bill would have a full house. *Ten Years Conflict*, II, 419.

103 *Acts of Ass.*, (1843), 19-29.

104 *Morning Chronicle*, June 15, 1843, p. 4. The Moderates, on the other hand, claimed that Aberdeen's Bill was a farce since it modified the Act of 1712, and in so doing, "virtually revokes the decision of the House of Lords in the Auchterarder case." *Blackwoods*, LIV (1843), 547, did not agree and said that Aberdeen's Bill only limited, but did not destroy, patronage. *The Edin. Rev.*, LXXVIII (1843), 535, was very critical: "A legislative declaration of the law is made, contrary to the law as decided by the House of Lords on appeal; and thus the legislature has been called upon to stigmatize by statute, a judgement of the highest court of the land."

Covenanters"¹⁰⁵ was now revived in those leaders who took up the cause of the spiritual independence of their beloved church. Claiming final authority for that Church in all purely spiritual concerns, and holding the abolition of patronage an indispensable condition of the integrity of that Church, they assumed so stern, distinct, and uncompromising language that it should have been evident to all that there was no alternative but for the State to accede to their demands or to face a secession.

In view of this fact, frankly avowed by the Non-Intrusionist leaders, whose characters afforded "full assurance that the resolution which they avowed was no idle menace, and that they would deem no sacrifice too great for the assertion of their principles,"¹⁰⁶ why did this question occasion so much controversy and strife? One reason is that to the Evangelicals this was basically and almost exclusively a religious question upon which they thought sincerely and felt deeply. The Scottish temper on religious subjects was such as to preclude the possibility of concession to the State which was now challenging their doctrine of Christ's headship. Over and over again they promised that rather than see their "Redeemer dethroned from his seat," as Aberdeen lightly put it, they would leave their manse and glebe and throw their stipends to the winds.¹⁰⁷

In the second place, the Scots were firmly convinced that the lukewarmness in their Church, the lack of apostolic zeal in the Master's cause, was due to patronage.¹⁰⁸ This was the root of all evil! It was patronage that had caused the numerous secessions and swelled the ranks of the Dissenters; it was patronage that had prevented the return of these bodies to the true church.

It was indeed unfortunate that such a question had to be settled in the British Parliament because there existed in that assembly opposing concepts of life, doctrine, and of ecclesiastical agencies. "The whole subject," as Buchanan so aptly put it,

was new and strange to the mass of British senators and statesmen. Accustomed to contemplate the relations of church and state through the medium of the English Establishment, where the supremacy in all matters and causes ecclesiastical is vested in the crown, and

¹⁰⁵ *Annual Register* (1843), 240.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁷ *Hansard*, 3d. ser., LVI, 1208; *Morning Chronicle*, Aug. 11, 1843, p. 4.

¹⁰⁸ Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, III, 347-348; Brown, *History of Scot.*, 430 et. seq.

where the queen in council . . . regulates almost everything, and the church herself regulates nothing,—it was easy to foresee how little prepared or predisposed they were likely to be to appreciate or acknowledge claims to which they had nothing similar among themselves.¹⁰⁹

When the disputed Veto Act first reached the House of Lords the Whigs were in office; at the time of dissolution, the Conservatives were. But it made little or no difference, as the Whigs, who had no real love for any church establishment, could not do anything if they had wanted to, and the Conservatives would not if they could.¹¹⁰ Furthermore, few people in England ever really understood this question. Melbourne honestly admitted being utterly ignorant of it and proved his ignorance by confounding "admission of ministers with presentation."¹¹¹ The Duke of Argyll asserts that he had never met an Englishman "who could understand, or even conceive, that idea of the relations between Church and State which was embedded and embodied in the Constitution of Scotland."¹¹² Cockburn thought the ignorance of Whigs and Conservatives on this subject was profound.¹¹³ and even Gladstone admitted that there was no subject more difficult for him to understand.¹¹⁴ Perhaps the best proof of their ignorance lies in the fact that even though dissolution was by 1839 almost as certain as death, neither the Whigs nor the Conservatives really believed it and both still thought that firmness alone would win the day. In addition, many proved themselves totally ignorant of the chief qualities of the Scottish character by doubting the seriousness of their threat to leave the Church. To make matters worse, Scottish Presbyterianism was not a religion for English gentlemen and they would not take the question seriously enough,¹¹⁵ nor could they understand why the Scots made such a furor over the matter. Many, in fact,

109 Buchanan, *Ten Years Conflict*, II, 122.

110 In a pamphlet, "What Ought the Church and People of Scotland to do Now?" Chalmers declared that the difference between Whigs and Tories was in "having no principle, or in having a principle that is wrong. In either way they are equally useless." Cited in Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, IV, 174.

111 Balfour, *Life of Aberdeen*, II, 74.

112 Argyll, *Memoirs*, I, 174.

113 Cockburn, *Journal*, II, 37.

114 See his letter to Graham, in Parker, *Life of Graham*, I, 374-375.

115 In 1839 the Earl of Galloway predicted that popular selection of clergymen would result in a kind of "preaching match" which would be won by those who could best reproduce the sermons of the eminent London preachers. See *Hansard*, 3d. ser., L, 376. The *Quart. Rev.*, LXVII (1840-41), 217,

sorely bored by the whole business, did not really care what happened to the Scottish Church¹¹⁶ other than to deprecate the impetus it gave to dissent in England.¹¹⁷ Some were stupid enough to imagine that the Evangelicals were leagued with the Chartists in a grand conspiracy to pull down the pillars of society,¹¹⁸ while others felt that the patrons had not been guilty of abusing their rights and that only a slight reform of patronage was necessary.¹¹⁹ Then, too, most of the English M. P.'s were thoroughgoing Erastians to whom, as the *Westminster Review* cynically, but accurately, commented, "relations of the clergy to the State imply no greater independence of control than those of soldiers and sailors."¹²⁰

Throughout this entire controversy the English political leaders assumed toward the non-intrusion question a purely legal attitude,¹²¹ and declared that obedience to the law as laid down by the courts of the realm was the first duty of all citizens. To them, the Church was an institution "established by civil law, represented by strictly legal courts, and having the Sovereign as over all persons and in all causes supreme."¹²² They alleged, therefore, that the Presbyterian system, as interpreted by the Non-Intrusionists, involved an inroad on the civil authority and hence was a menace to the liberty of the State.

declared that popular selection of ministers would result in "scenes of riot, profligacy, and fraud which characterize a Westminster election." Such ignorance and prejudice was equalled only by the stupidity of Collett, who declared in the House of Commons, that he was for "free trade in corn; . . . free trade in machinery; . . . and . . . free trade in parsons." *Hansard*, 3d. ser., LXXI, 530.

116 Aberdeen notes in his Journal on Jan. 4, 1841, that everyone was interested in the ministerial crisis and that "beyond a passing joke it [Scot. Church] is scarcely ever mentioned." Cited in Balfour, *Life of Aberdeen*, II, 90.

117 *Morning Chronicle*, Nov. 16, 1843, p. 2; *Hansard*, 3d. ser., LIV, 362.

118 Most of the Evangelical leaders were conservatives and had opposed the Reform Bill of 1832. See Hanna, *Memoirs of Chalmers*, III, 405; Buchanan, *Ten Years Conflict*, II, 181.

119 *Quart. Rev.*, LXVII, (1840-41), 203 et. seq.; Parker, *Life of Graham*, I, 381 et. seq.

120 *West. Rev.*, XL (1843), 208.

121 Such journals as the *Quart. Rev.*, *West. Rev.*, and *Blackwoods* considered this a legal question in which the chief issue was not the Church but whether or not the law of the land was to be enforced. See also *Hansard*, 3d. ser., LI, 356; LXVII, 394; Charles S. Parker, *Sir Robert Peel from his Private Papers* (London, 1899), II, 470.

122 Argyll, *Memoirs*, I, 175. *Blackwoods* (XLVI, 579), asserts that, as an institution established by law, the Church of Scotland was nothing but an incorporation whose powers and privileges "rest exclusively on statute law; and the Court of Session is the proper and legally constituted interpreter of a statute."

But while the English held to the majesty of the law and the sovereignty of Parliament, the Non-Intrusionists appealed to a "higher law"—the Bible and to a higher sovereign—God! Viewing the question as a theological one, the uncompromising Scots charged that the Erastian State was impinging on the spiritual authority of the Church and therefore menaced its liberty and freedom.

In a larger sense, the English Government, which in the mid-nineteenth century was rapidly becoming a strongly unitary state, found itself opposed by the Scottish Non-Intrusionists, who, like the Jesuits on the continent, were fighting for the principle of federalism—a principle which stressed the impossibility of confining sovereignty to any one of its constituent parts.¹²³ Hence, they insisted, neither the spiritual courts nor the civil courts should coerce the other in their own sphere.¹²⁴ But since the English Government held to the view that in questions of conflicting jurisdiction it was the civil courts that must decide whether cases were spiritual or temporal, compromise was impossible. If, theoretically at least, the State was victorious in 1843, it admitted in 1874, when it abolished patronage by law, that it had sustained a moral defeat.

123 See John N. Figgis, *The Divine Right of Kings*, Preface vii-viii.

124 Buchanan, *Ten Years Conflict*, II, 286. According to *Blackwoods*, XLVI (1839), 575, the Church Courts had no power of execution, could not ordain payment, provide a remedy, or give redress of wrongs. Only the civil courts could do so and they were therefore superior courts.

MINUTES OF THE
FIFTY-THIRD CONSECUTIVE MEETING
OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

APRIL 24 and 25, 1942

The American Society of Church History held its fifty-third consecutive meeting (eighteenth spring meeting) at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

FRIDAY, APRIL 24

The meeting was held in the Small Chapel, Administration Building of the Lutheran Theological Seminary. It was opened by the Chairman, Dr. David Dunn.

The first paper was presented by Dr. Theodore G. Tappert of Philadelphia. His subject was *Henry Melchior Muhlenberg and his Journals*. Dr. George W. Richards of Lancaster then read a paper on *Schlatter and Muhlenberg*, after which a free discussion followed on these complementary themes.

At 5 p. m. a visit was made to Conewago Chapel, pioneer centre of Roman Catholic worship, where the members were cordially received by the Rev. Father J. F. O'Donnell, who conducted them through the Chapel pointing out its architectural beauties and describing the murals which adorn this historic shrine.

The dinner was held in the Seminary Refectory at 7:00 p. m., and was presided over by President E. R. Hardy, Jr. After dinner he introduced President A. R. Wentz of Gettysburg Seminary, who welcomed the Society in its behalf.

The address of the evening was given by Dr. James R. Joy of New York City, on the subject: *Methodist Unification—Sidelights and Inside Lights*.

SATURDAY, APRIL 25

The meeting opened in the Small Chapel at 9:30 a. m., Dr. Niels Henry Sonne presiding.

The first paper, on the subject: *Law and Liberty in the Leveller Movement*, was read by Dr. William Haller of New York City. The second paper, *Church and State: Cromwell's Solution*, by Dr. Addison H. Leitch of Grove City, Pa., followed immediately, after which the two papers were discussed in conjunction with one another.

At the business meeting which was then called by the President, the minutes of the 52d meeting, held in Chicago, December 28 and 29, 1941 were approved as published in the March, 1942, issue of *Church History*.

The President was authorized to appoint a Program Committee for the 1943 Spring Meeting.

The committee which had been appointed then presented the following resolutions, which were adopted:

The American Society of Church History desires to express to President Wentz and the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., its deep appreciation of their hospitality upon the occasion of the 53rd consecutive meeting of the Society. It would record its pleasure in the hospitality of the Rev. Father J. F. O'Donnell of Conewago Chapel, and its sense of obligation to Professor Robert Fortenbaugh, Chairman of the Program Committee, and his able assistants, David Dunn and Niels Henry Sonne. Finally, it would extend its sincere thanks to Theodore G. Tappert, George W. Richards, William Haller and Addison H. Leitch for their scholarly papers, and to Dr. James R. Joy for his brilliant and illuminating address.

Dr. Rockwell brought before the Society an interesting project in American Church History. After some discussion the following resolution was adopted:

The American Society of Church History at its Spring Meeting, held at Gettysburg, Pa., on the 25th of April, 1942, has heard with great interest the report of the Committee on the History of Religion among Pennsylvania Germans, and expresses its deep interest in the project as described by

Dr. Rockwell, President Wentz and John Joseph Stoudt of Allentown, Pa., concerning the preliminary plans for the preparation and publication of a series of volumes by competent specialists. The Spring Meeting recommends to the Editor of *Church History* that its columns be opened to a further announcement.

Professor Fortenbaugh having announced that a tour of the battlefield would be conducted immediately after lunch in the Refectory, there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Attest: Thos. C. Pears, Jr.
Secretary.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

APRIL 24, 1942

The Council met at the call of President E. R. Hardy, Jr., in the Administration Building, on Friday, April 24, 1942 at 9 p. m.

The following members were present: E. R. Hardy, Jr., Herbert Wallace Schneider, and Thos. C. Pears, Jr.

As these members did not constitute a quorum, no official business could be done.

The meeting was adjourned to be called at an early date by the President.

Attest: THOS. C. PEARS, JR.,
Secretary.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

MAY 14, 1942

The Council met at the call of the President, E. R. Hardy, Jr., at the General Theological Seminary, New York City, Thursday afternoon, May 14, 1942, at 2:15 o'clock.

The following members were present: E. R. Hardy, Jr., Robert Hastings Nichols, Cyril C. Richardson, Herbert Wallace Schneider, and Thos. C. Pears, Jr.

This was an adjourned meeting of the Council, as a quorum had not been present at the time of the Spring Meeting held in Gettysburg, April 24, 1942.

The first subject discussed was the replies to the questionnaire previously mailed to every member of the Council, with regard to the place of meeting of the next Annual Meeting. As the majority of these replies favored holding the sessions at the same time and place as those of the American Historical Association, the Secretary was ordered to recommend the same to the Chairman of the Program Committee.

It was likewise resolved to refer to the next meeting of the Council the consideration of a plan to meet with the American Association on alternate years, holding the meetings of the Society separately on alternate years at one or other of the Seminaries.

F. W. Buckler made the following report by letter: "It seemed inadvisable, after preliminary negotiations, to make a formal application for full membership in the American Council of Learned Societies; in place of the action suggested by the Council of the Society, however, the ex-President has made definite application for the inclusion of the American Society of Church History by a representative on the Committee on the History of Religion of the American Council of Learned Societies. Inasmuch as certain constitutional changes are necessary in the present arrangements and conditions of mem-

bership, nothing further has been heard or can be expected until those changes have been accomplished."

The Council authorized the President to appoint a Committee to examine the By-Laws and to suggest any desirable amendments to the next meeting of the Council. Whereupon Robert Hastings Nichols and Thos. C. Pears, Jr., were appointed such a committee.

The Secretary then presented his report. The resignations of the following were accepted with regret: Edwin P. Booth, Boston, Mass., Homer W. Brainard, Amherst, Mass., Mrs. Allan B. Cole, Austin, Texas, Glanville Downey, New Haven, Conn., Chester F. Dunham, Toledo, Ohio, Curtis W. Garrison, Fremont, Ohio, Elijah A. Hanley, Berkeley, Cal., MacKinley Helm, Brookline, Mass., Albert A. Jagnow, Dubuque, Iowa, John H. Raven, New Brunswick, N. J., and Mrs. Leon P. Smith, Chicago, Ill.

The following members were reported as having died since the last meeting:

William Chalmers Covert, Philadelphia, Pa.
Andrew C. Zenos, Chicago, Ill.

The following candidates, properly nominated and seconded by members of the Society, were elected, subject to the fulfillment of the constitutional requirements concerning membership:

Prof. S. J. England, 2202 East Maple Street, Enid, Okla.
Rev. Harold S. Faust, 2049 E. York St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. Nolan B. Harmon, Jr., 150 Fifth Ave., New York City.
Prof. Hugh T. Kerr, Jr., Princeton, N. J.
Rev. William H. Owen, 88 Morningside Drive, New York City.
Rev. Walter M. Stowe, 5 Paterson St., New Brunswick, N. J.
Rev. Galbraith Hall Todd, Niagara Falls, N. Y.
Ronald W. Wells, 115 West Cliff St., Summerville, N. J.
Rev. Erwin T. Umbach, 158 Rockcress Road, Manhasset, L. I., N. Y.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Attest: THOS. C. PEARS, JR.,
Secretary.

BOOK REVIEWS

ARISTOTLE AND ANGLICAN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

By VICTOR LYLE DOWDELL. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1942. 103 pages. \$1.50.

This brief monograph, the Bohlen Lectures for 1941, is in the main a contribution to the history of classical scholarship. It is designed to show that "if the works of Aristotle should be lost, they could be reconstructed from the writings of Anglican divines." The author has managed to fill his pages with a wealth of biographical and bibliographical information of much value and interest. His engaging enthusiasm and smooth style save his work from the dullness and monotony which so often spoil this sort of encyclopedic procedure. It is obvious, of course, that any well-educated theologian will have studied and utilized Aristotle; but it may be a surprise to some, who think of Anglican thought as rooted and grounded in Platonism, to read this record of the Stagyrte's influence. Of Hooker, the author says, "the whole texture of his works is Aristotelian"; the Cambridge Platonists "were in part, the largest part, Aristotelians"; "Butler may well be considered the most significant Aristotelian in the Anglican Church"; and so on through many less well-known writers. Back of much of this Aristotelianism was, of course, the dominant place which Aristotle continued to hold in the universities long after the Reformation. We miss in this study, however, any synthetic discussion of the extent to which Aristotelianism has characterized the general direction and content of Anglican theology, and whether it has given any substantial unity to the complex nature of Anglican comprehensiveness. Perhaps the author will give us at some future time a more thorough analysis of his summary statement that "the foundations of Anglican epistemology and psychology are Aristotelian in a special sense; they are not Platonic."

Episcopal Theological School
Cambridge, Mass.

Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.

THE ABBEY OF ST. DENIS, 475-1122

By SUMNER MCKNIGHT CROSBY. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942. xiv, 211 pages. \$7.00.

To casual American visitors who take the trouble to go out to a grimy industrial center four miles from the *Gare du Nord* of Paris, the Royal Church of St. Denis is the Washington Cathedral of France. Here is epitomized, in sculpture and architecture, the political history of France from Merovingian times to World War II. No less fascinating

and important is the abbey from the standpoint of art history. Here are summarized the major developments of architecture in France: Romanesque, Gothic, Rayonnant, Renaissance, Classicistic, and Revivalist. With aptness the Abbey of St. Denis has been called the very "cradle of Gothic architecture."

Fully equal to the importance of the *Basilique* are the difficulties inherent in any sound archeological investigation of its structure. For primary sources the researcher must employ a vast aggregation of medieval and modern buildings, that have barely survived heart-breaking vicissitudes of destruction and restoration; and a most perplexing mass of medieval documents and modern records, that are extremely difficult to interpret and evaluate. Zestfully rushing in "where angels fear to tread," the author has undertaken to analyze the chief architectural problems presented by the Royal Abbey, to criticize the results of modern researches regarding it, and to contribute crucial corrections from a recent (1938-39) archeological examination of its structure. In the present publication, which is Volume I of a series, Sumner McKnight Crosby accomplishes all this very competently for the period indicated, 475-1122.

Of pre-Carolingian buildings enshrining the relics of Saint Denis there are no known remnants on the abbey site. Hence the early chapters in this volume are much more interesting to the historian than to the architect. These concern the legend of Saint Denis, the development of his cult, and the early religious community. Such questions as the following are answered quite convincingly in these chapters: Who was Saint Denis? Where was he martyred? Why did legend affirm that he carried his own head from the place of execution to the place of his burial? How and why did he become the patron of French monarchy? To what extent were contemporary monastic trends reflected in the early history of this community of St. Denis? The carping critic may say that these initial chapters are disproportionately long. If so, the student of church history will not regret the length of treatment.

Even without known remains to work from the author has definite things to say about the first church building of the community. It was a basilica. It dated from the time of Saint Genevieve, ca. 475. Dagobert I did not rebuild it, but only refurbished it. The tomb of Saint Denis was high and had a pitched roof. Very wisely the question of location is left indeterminate. Was it on the site of the present *Basilique*? Or was it at the other end of what was, in pre-Vichy days, the *Rue de la République*, where stands today the elegant church of *St. Denis de l'Estrée* built by Viollet-le-Duc?

Crosby's architectural and archeological capabilities are best displayed in his highly important chapters on Fulrad's church (775). His reconstruction of this experimental Carolingian building is tangibly based on a few square meters of foundation masonry, the exterior of the chevet at the eastern end, the present location of the high altar, a few fragments of superstructure, and some indications in the twelfth century masonry of good Abbot Suger. Yet from these slender vestiges he can produce

a measured ground plan of Fulrad's church as a Latin basilica with a polygonal apse and continuous transepts, an annular crypt of the *confessio* variety, and a porch within its western facade. He can even specify the level of the pavement, the height of the side aisles and the nave, the shafts of the nave colonnade, the scheme of fenestration, etc. Perhaps he is at his very best in his criticisms of interior volumes and exterior masses and visual effects. From it all he has important generalizations to record in characterization of Carolingian architecture as an expression of contemporary life.

The author has done as well by Hilduin's exterior chapel of relics, added to the church in 832.

This report is generously documented by nearly a hundred illustrations, including collotypes, colored plates, and line drawings. Unfortunately these are not always as effectively related to the text as they should be. The sequence of illustrations is confused in places; and sometimes the best illustration is not specified by reference in the text. Highly effective are the acetate-sheeting transparencies and the photographs of the plastacelle model of Fulrad's basilica.

Crosby himself would desire the reviewer to emphasize that this series does not represent the definitive publication of St. Denis architecture. World War II must be over and time must be taken for much more extensive excavations *in situ* before that definitive work can be produced.

Even in its character as an "*hors d'oeuvre*," however, this competent volume creates an excellent appetite for Volume II and for the more determinative volumes that must follow.

The University of Chicago.

Harold R. Willoughby.

MEDIEVAL HUMANISM

By GERALD GROVELAND WALSH. S. J. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. ix, 103 pages. \$1.00.

Professor Walsh's study is a useful addition to the *Christendom* series. It should be evaluated not as a hopelessly abbreviated history of medieval culture but as an interpretative essay, by an able Roman Catholic scholar, on a particular, and much neglected, medieval tradition. Christian humanism, interpreted in terms of man's proper search for true happiness, is that tradition whose development the author seeks to establish and clarify. A wealth of highly selected data is adduced to that end. Paganism is thought of as being transcended by Christianity in a mighty synthesis wherein Hellenic, Roman, Celtic, and other cultural traditions were interfused with the supplemental "ideas of Creation, Incarnation, Sanctification."

The last half of the work illustrates the vitality of the great monastic teachers, evaluates the cultural *revirescence* of the twelfth century, and briefly analyzes the scholastic impulse. Following the discussion of Thomas Aquinas, Dante Alighieri is presented as the

crowning example of "a medieval or Christian humanist," the consummately happy soul that cultivates "intelligence, conscience and taste, in the light of both reason and Revelation, and with the force of both passion and Grace. . . ."

The book is interestingly written. Source passages, presented in the original with translation, are germane to the author's purpose of illustrating the flexibility and freshness of Christian humanism.

Duke University.

R. C. Petry.

THE CHRISTIAN APPROACH TO THE MOSLEM

By JAMES THAYER ADDISON. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. x, 365 pages. \$3.75.

This is a historical survey of the thirteen centuries of the Christian missionary work among the Mohemmedans. The first part consists of a hurried sketch of the twelve centuries of the background, while the bulk of the book is devoted to the remaining century of the modern period. Although a useful survey, the first part is clearly a preliminary to the main interest of the work, and as such makes no new contribution. One regrets to point out some minor misstatements: The Vandal invasion of Africa began in 425, not 438 (p. 16); the Emperor Michael who expelled the Latins from the Empire of Romania in 1261 was the VIII, not the II (p. 32); Hulagu did not profess "to be a Christian" but had a Christian mother and a Christian wife (p. 59). I also think it more correct to say that the Armenian Church remained pre-Chalcedonian in its theological position, rather than Monophysite (p. 16).

It is, however, the second part, dealing with the modern period, which forms the really valuable section of the book. It surveys with adequate detail the entire Moslem world, from Mauretania on the northwestern shores of Africa to the most eastern portions of the Netherlands East Indies. From this living scene emerges a clear recognition that in Islam Christianity is confronting a virile, expansive force, which is successfully contending with it in many missionary fields, particularly the East Indies and Africa. Indian Islam, too, is a power which must be reckoned with. Moreover, Islam has hitherto furnished almost uniformly the most difficult and unpromising mission field, so that in the future the conflict between these two religions is likely to grow even more intense.

For this balanced, informing, and adequate account of the missionary task among the Mohammedans the book is among the best which has so far appeared. The bibliography, although omitting some important literature on the Eastern Orthodox churches, is quite adequate for the modern period.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

Matthew Spinka.

MARLOWE'S TAMBURLAINE: A STUDY IN RENAISSANCE
MORAL PHILOSOPHY

By ROY W. BATTENHOUSE. Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Press, 1941. xiv, 266 pages. \$2.50.

This book offers "a reinterpretation of the play which is generally reckoned the earliest great tragedy in English." Like Mr. Panofsky who in his *Studies in Iconology* "surveyed the doctrines of Neoplatonism in order to put in proper framework the interpretation of Michelangelo's art," so Professor Battenhouse in six background chapters has provided "a discriminating map of the great tradition of Reformation Humanism, somewhere within which Marlowe seems to belong." In these background chapters he discusses "Elizabethan Religion and Atheism," "Raleigh's Religion," "Chapman's Religion," "Theories of Fortune, Fate and Providence," "The Theory of Punishment," "The Moral Uses of Poetry." Fully one-half of the book is devoted to background. One cannot help asking whether so much scaffolding has been maturely considered. The chapters on Raleigh and Chapman in particular may seem far-sought. The author appears to have anticipated this query. He says: "To the general reader I should like to say that my discussion of the play is fairly complete without the background chapters," which are "intended to be sufficiently detailed to satisfy the historian of ideas, and can be skipped by anyone whose interests are more purely literary" (p. ix).

However, to one who has learned to look for Reformation Humanism in Elizabethan literature, Dr. Battenhouse need not apologize for his background studies. Failure to see Marlowe in the context of his times has led to extravagances in criticism. Thus, F. S. Boas sees Marlowe himself in *Tamburlaine*; Miss Ellis-Fermor feels that "to understand Marlowe demands eternal youth," that "the spirit and 'desire' of man are neither more nor less than God in man," an idea "startlingly modern, or at least startlingly independent of his contemporaries." But this "romanticism" breaks down when it "cannot stomach the frank worldliness of *Tamburlaine's* ambition." The drama has been studied "not with the eyes of an Elizabethan, to whom ambition was sin, but with the eyes of a modern, to whom upward striving is noble." Besides, Miss Ellis-Fermor's view necessitates a depreciation of Part II of *Tamburlaine*. Others, still identifying *Tamburlaine* with Marlowe, make the dramatist a frank "Machiavellian." Some, with more "common sense," suggest that Marlowe need not at all "consciously" identify himself with his Titan any more than Milton with his Satan, and that he rather "turns history into good actable drama." The latter view, though suggestive, tends to miss the "morality" aspects of *Tamburlaine*, specific features of which are noted.

The author then proceeds to develop his theme: "In both parts of the drama the artistic use of morality themes has served to formalize the action. Extra-historical episodes enhance the story's import as parable. I believe it can be shown that *Tamburlaine* carries out the effort, made by the author of the earlier *Cambises*, to combine the morality play with

the dramatization of history." Therefore he goes somewhat extensively into the morality literature of the times; hence the subtitle of the book: "A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy." The chapter on "Extra-Historical Morality Elements" (150-177) illustrates the point.

Certain historians of doctrine may incline to disagree with the statement about "the tendencies toward Christian heterodoxy which Platonism encourages" (56). "Shorey remarks aptly enough that Platonism encouraged heresy by stimulating free inquiry and mythopoetic imagination . . . Shorey calls Plato 'the chief and best source of ethical and natural religion throughout European literature'" (28 note 19). That Platonism stimulates free inquiry and is the best source of ethical and natural religion is generally granted, but that it particularly fosters heresy does not follow. It did quite the contrary in the case of St. Augustine. Christian orthodoxy is naturally deflected from its course by exclusive interest in any philosopher; the fathers of the church were want to call themselves eclectics. Christianity assumed the rôle of defender, corrector, and fulfiller of philosophy. But of all philosophers the Platonists have been considered "nearest to us," to use St. Augustine's phrase. Plato's interest in *libre examen*, natural religion, and ethics was agreeable to the fathers rather than offensive. The point need not be labored; the debate about Plato and orthodoxy will go on forever. Our author, who is generally very guarded in his statements, in our opinion nodded here.

All in all, the volume is a sound contribution to Reformation Humanism. Being no expert in Marlowe criticism, my statement that reading *Tamburlaine* since studying this book has been more fruitful is worth whatever a layman's judgment is worth.

University of Oregon.

Quirinus Breen.

MEN OF SUBSTANCE

By W. K. JORDAN. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. 283 pages. \$3.00.

Mr. Jordan has presented us with another valuable study in the rapidly expanding literature on Stuart Puritanism. He finds the Civil War being precipitated not by religious zealots but by conservative men of substance—the landed gentry and the commercial aristocracy—who sought to extend the boundaries of political liberty, establish a free economy, and who, in order to hold together the loose coalition waging the war, were compelled "to espouse the doctrine of religious toleration." As men of substance, however, they were careful to place "precise and rigid frontiers at which the flood of change must be halted," and in so doing they defined the characteristics of eighteenth and nineteenth century English liberalism.

To illustrate the two conservative elements initiating and carrying forward the revolution, the author selects the two most original and significant theoreticians of the period—Henry Parker, "a member of the

ancient aristocracy of the land," and Henry Robinson, "a scion of one of the oldest of the great merchant families." As might be expected, Parker was the political theorist *par excellence*, while Robinson was the most important figure of his day in the realm of economic and social thought. Although the two men sought the same goal, they approached it along diverse paths and were almost completely dissimilar in temperament. Parker—cold, logical, and pragmatic—was the Erastian, anti-clerical, free-thinking leader of the lawyers, military men, and skeptics. Robinson, on the other hand, was pious, generous, warm-hearted, and a man of principle. Parker advocated religious toleration as a matter of practical politics, whereas Robinson urged religious liberty so that the free spirit might go forth unshackled in its quest for truth.

The thought of both men contains many exceedingly stimulating and provocative suggestions with regard to a wide variety of contemporary problems—political, economic, and religious. Particular attention should be given to Robinson's discussion of Christian unity by all who are interested in the Ecumenical Movement, and lawyers will find ideas worth pondering in his suggestions for the reformation of the legal profession.

The volume is incisively written, thoroughly sound in its scholarship, and the author is to be congratulated on his exceptionally well-conceived plan of presenting his argument in the frame-work provided by the thought of these two representative men of substance. Two minor suggestions might be made. A clearer distinction perhaps ought to be made between the Independents as a well-organized religious group prior to the time of the Long Parliament and the so-called Independent party of the Civil War years which represented a somewhat amorphous coalescence of many elements in English political and religious life. Also a rather romantic aura is cast over the Elizabethan Establishment. The character of the "noble and tolerant church" of that period, it is to be suspected, was dictated more by the Queen's stubborn caprice, the fact of her birth, and the threat of a Spanish invasion than by the lofty rationalizations provided by Jewel and Hooker.

Colgate-Rochester Divinity School.

Winthrop S. Hudson.

A HISTORY OF QUAKERISM

By ELBERT RUSSELL. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. 586 pages. \$3.00.

This book by Dean Russell is an authoritative and fascinating history of the Society of Friends. This history is treated as a part of modern social history, which is the only way any history should be treated. Not so long ago, history was treated as the record of wars and their attendant changes in the political structure. But that time is gone, and history is now rightly considering the whole fabric of social life. Religion can never be separated from social history, and certainly, as this book amply demonstrates, Quakerism is a current in the stream of social change.

The historic roots of Quakerism go deep into European life; its development goes deep into American life. Dr. Russell divides his history into three main sections: the rise of the Society of Friends, 1647-1691; the age of Quietism, 1691-1827; and the modern revival and reconstruction, 1827-1941. Quakerism is, to a great extent, the lengthened shadows of great men. George Fox is the dominating figure of the first period and its story reads like a modern Book of Acts. Imprisonment and persecution made the Society flourish and expand. From this time its fortunes became closely linked with American history. The most widely influential man in the second period was John Woolman. And here let it be noted that this book makes an important contribution in emphasizing the fact that the "age of quietism" produced the great exponents of the social gospel. Exponents of the "social gospel" today can learn much from these "quietists." It was the social vision of these men and women who produced those who opposed slavery and were largely instrumental in ridding the world of its curse. John Woolman was also a man of letters, and the literary life of the Quakers is phenomenal. They were tireless writers and pamphleteers because they believed so thoroughly in their way of life. A part of the intense literary activity naturally produced theological controversy. The life of Elias Hicks, the younger contemporary of John Woolman, overlaps the second period by only three years. Let it be noted that the Quakers who, too often, have been accused of "mere mysticism" produced the great social workers, the philanthropists, the emancipators and the reformers. The third period takes in Whittier and the Civil War. After this war, the Society settled down to its task of building a better world. When the World War came along, it was the Friends who made the most enduring impression on both Europe and America. Other noteworthy emphases in this book are the struggle for women's rights and the importance placed by the Friends on education. Their schools and colleges have made an impressive contribution to our social history. Here is the best single volume history of the Quakers in print. Dr. Russell is also the man to have written this book. His personal knowledge of the movement, his distinguished scholarship and service all prepared him for the task. The book has a carefully selected bibliography which adds to its general usefulness.

Atchison, Kansas.

Charles A. Hawley.

GEORGE KEITH, 1638-1716

By MRS. E. W. KIRBY. New York: Appleton-Century, 1942. vi, 177 pages. \$3.00.

Students of colonial church history have long been aware of the important rôle of George Keith in American religious affairs at the close of the seventeenth century, but not until the recent publication of Mrs. E. W. Kirby's excellent study have they been able to get a full length, detailed and objective story of his career. Keith was born of

Scotch Presbyterian parents and studied at Marischall College, Aberdeen, but, before ordination, turned to Quakerism. He rapidly became a respected and valued leader as well as a most influential writer of this sect, and an intimate of the group of spiritual giants which included George Fox, Robert Barclay, William Penn and others. After thirty years, he departed from his adopted faith to become, for a season, an independent preacher, and at last, a clerical member of the Church of England and missionary to America.

Keith came to America in 1685 and settled in East Jersey as surveyor general. Later he moved to Philadelphia to conduct the Friends' school there. During this period he broke with Quakerism. Mrs. Kirby discusses the events associated with the schism in a masterly fashion. She feels that the basic cause was the radical difference between George Keith's sophisticated religious outlook and the simple faith in "the light within" of the New World Quakers. Keith constantly urged orthodoxy upon a people who knew little of orthodoxy. One highly educated in the religious lore of the Old World and accustomed to associate with others of similar character naturally could find little in common with uncultivated pioneers. Keith published a catechism for children and urged the adoption of a plan of church government and discipline, which was rejected by the Philadelphia yearly meeting. These factors led to serious conflicts with the leaders of the Friends both in religious societies and in the state.

George Keith returned to England to seek vindication there but soon found the Quakers almost consistently opposed to him and he was formally disowned by the London Yearly Meeting. He now opened independent religious meetings at Turner's Hall in London. This period as an independent preacher found him growing closer and closer to the Church of England clergy until at length he joined them. The newly started Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge found excellent use for his abilities as missionary to redeem Quakers in America from their heresy. Mrs. Kirby has told the interesting story of this trip to America in great detail and has successfully chosen many of the best incidents to illustrate his methods.

Mrs. Kirby's book will undoubtedly stand as the definitive biography of George Keith. She has carefully investigated the details of his life and presented them with clarity and sound judgment. She has used the available printed sources and has searched out elusive material in manuscripts and in rarely consulted records. The general thesis that George Keith was an intellectual "seeker" who was inevitably pushed into the paths that he followed in religious thinking seems sound. Her work is well fortified with adequate references and a good bibliography which, however, is defective in not listing the numerous discussions of George Keith which may be found in periodical literature.

Drew Theological Seminary,
Madison, N. J.

Niels Henry Sonne.

AN APPRAISAL OF THE NEGRO IN COLONIAL SOUTH CAROLINA

By FRANK J. KLINGBERG. Washington, D. C.: The Associated Publishers, 1941. 180 pages. \$2.00.

This monograph from a professor of history in the University of California at Los Angeles says that Negroes have made contributions to "the main stream of United States history." Its supporting data are chiefly letters of the S.P.G. in South Carolina, arranged in six chapters. This one Anglican society, Dr. Klingberg believes, "uncovered all the problems of race relationship between the white men and the Negro that appeared at any time since" colonial days. The contributions of Negroes to the unskilled labor and to the skilled crafts of South Carolina seem proven, and all details of this painstaking study become usable because of the full index which was prepared by Miss Helen C. Livingstone. Dr. Woodson's Associated Publishers issue this volume in most attractive form, and it is dedicated "to Dr. Carter Godwin Woodson Founder of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, Author, Editor, and Publisher of Significant Work, Establishing that American History Is One Story of All Its Peoples."

Lengthy discussion is deservedly given to "The Charleston Negro School" of 1743-1764 under Commissary Alexander Gardner. Commissary Gardner had been in South Carolina since 1719 (103), but it was not until 1740 that he proposed his Negro school (104f.) which, perhaps, was an experiment to prove mental capacity. Since, however, this school and its conservative religious teachings were begun immediately following the alarming Stono Rebellion of South Carolina slaves in 1739 (68 n. 26), it appears that the militancy of slaves helped to call forth this humanitarian enterprise. The author notes in passing an additional gift of the Negroes to things of the spirit, which contribution is primarily among the dissenters. The scholarship of a distinguished historian is here a definite encouragement to the Negro genius.

Miles Mark Fisher.

VOLTAIRE, PASCAL AND HUMAN DESTINY

By MINA WATERMAN. New York: King's Crown Press, 1942. 130 pages. \$2.50.

Here is another book to add to the long list of recent studies of the struggle between the Catholics of France (Jesuit and Jansenist) and the *philosophes* which may be conveniently regarded as commencing with Bayle and culminating in the apotheosis of Voltaire and the cult of Theophilanthropy. Was Lanson's great edition of the *Lettres Philosophiques* (1908) the rock that set the geyser gushing? Or Brandes' *Voltaire* (1916)? Or Lovejoy's article on "The Parallel between Deism and Classicism" in *Modern Philology* (1922)? Or is all this publication due to the resentment of academic *litterateurs* against the post-bellum reaction toward neo-Thomism and Barthianism? That it constitutes a

phenomenon of considerable theological, as well as literary, significance, is obvious from the number of titles cited by Miss Waterman in her Introduction (pp X-XI) and her excellent bibliography. Her study is the fifth of the kind that the writer has reviewed for *Church History*; his curiosity is perhaps accounted for by the reflection that when he began studying the field in 1914, he was embarrassed not by its riches but by poverty in just such thorough and revealing scholarship as Miss Waterman exhibits.

She makes us spectators of a duel in logic, wit, and learning between two great literary geniuses: the physicist-metaphysician Pascal who decided his "wager" in favor of Jansenist Catholicism in 1654, and set himself till his death in 1662 to writing those preliminaries of a great Apology that we know as his *Pensées*, published by the Port Royalists in 1669. Fifty years later "*le sublime misanthrope*," as Voltaire called him, became "Voltaire's personal enemy, to be combatted incessantly until the cause of the Enlightenment was won . . . the magnificent and dangerous *Pensées* had to be refuted as long as any kind of injustice was perpetrated in the name of God and Mammon, Voltaire could never lay down his pen" (p. 14). Both duellists were highly intellectualized; both were frail, nervous invalids, but the battle was a fierce one for each wielded a mighty pen. That it settled nothing, our present controversies evince.

Our author summarizes and appraises very capably the main points of the *Pensées* and the rebuttal of the *Remarques sur les Pensées*. To review this long dialectic, exciting though it is, exceeds our space. Serious though the theme and issue, Miss Waterman assists us now and then by a delightful anecdote: how, for instance, Voltaire, mischievously profiting by the hostility of the Jansenists for the Jesuits, named a vessel of his, rented to the King of Portugal for the expedition in 1756 against the Jesuit *Reduções* in Paraguay—"Pascal"! Since Pascal was anti-rationalist, pessimistic, fideistic, and authoritarian, most of the doctrines and arguments now in vogue with the critics of Liberalism are to be found in, or inferred from, the *Pensées*; while Voltaire's refutations have a remarkably modern ring. The reviewer heartily recommends the book not only for its sound scholarship but as worthy of perusal by the theological dialecticians of either party in the arena of today.

The Meadville Theological School,
Chicago.

Charles H. Lyttle.

DIDEROT'S TREATMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IN THE *ENCYCLOPÉDIE*

By JOSEPH EDMUND BARKER. New York: King's Crown Press, 1941.
143 pages. \$2.00.

Like the revival of Freemasonry, the modern encyclopedia had its origin in the enthusiasm of the early eighteenth century for natural philosophy (science), natural religion, and natural law. Like Freemasonry, too, the English original (Chamber's *Cyclopedia* of 1728) was

imitated and elaborated in the French *Encyclopédie* of 1752-80. Continuing the analogy: both editors, Ephraim Chambers and Denis Diderot, were freethinkers whose purpose was not only to diffuse knowledge but to oppose superstition, by which they chiefly meant church Christianity. The analogy breaks down, however, on the question of censorship. Chambers, living in "liberal" England, had to contend with nothing like that which drove Diderot to the employment of most ingenious, though dubious means to outwit the Jesuit and Jansenist censors placed over him. So, taken article by article, his treatment of Christianity might to the unwary seem respectful; yet in each article there is a clever "catch" concealed, so that taken altogether the effect of the great work (35 volumes folio!) was really an impudent attack upon those aspects of religion which the body of *philosophes* regarded as preposterous and pernicious. Dr. Barker concludes that of 300 articles, about one-third are wholly or almost wholly orthodox, being based largely on orthodox sources, such as the Jesuit *Dictionnaire de Trévoux*, Calmet's *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Brucker's *Historia Critica Philosophiae* (a Protestant work). About one fourth are partly orthodox and partly skeptical, with mixed sources, the orthodox sources having often been altered or interpreted to mean what their authors did not intend them to mean. The final one-fourth, of a philosophical nature, present Diderot's own views on natural morality (125).

Now if we ask how the articles in the last two classes could have passed the scrutiny of the censors, it is answered that (1) the censors were incredibly "imbecile," as Diderot wrote Voltaire in 1758; (2) that if you, gentle reader, should ever have need to hoodwink the censorship of a politico-religious Fascism, Diderot's almost comically crafty tricks would afford you most valuable hints. It would be delightful to protract this review by describing them—they give a tart humor to Dr. Baker's pages; they are the citron in his plum cake.

A sub-title of the book might well be, "Diderot's Promulgation of his own Naturalistic Humanism in the *Encyclopédie*," for "in articles whose titles indicate no close relationship to Christian doctrines, all religion is represented as originating naturally in response to human needs and developing through the prevalence of human credulity and the duplicity of priests. Such rigorous tests of reason and experience are prescribed for the examination of religious phenomena as would rule out miracles and supernaturalism altogether. Religion in general, and by inference the Christian religion, is shown to be not only unnecessary to insure the moral life but as actually harmful to the only morality that is natural and universal . . ." (128). Palmer (*Catholics and Unbelievers in Eighteenth Century France*) suggests that such audacious irreligious propaganda was possible because of the strife between Jesuits and Jansenists, which distracted attention from their real adversary. Then there was the protection of the "enlightened" Catholic, La Pompadour and her minister, Maurepas. The reviewer would suggest as a further explanation, the absence in France of that ever useful catalytic agent, liberal Protestantism. It alone could have met Diderot and his *confrères* on his own grounds of reason, natural morality and science, just as the

Latitudinarians of England, both Anglican and Calvinist, eventually liquidated the extremists, Laud and the Presbyterians. Great are the uses of Liberalism in saving a country from the clash of rival fanaticisms! Dr. Barker's work is opulent in scholarship, ample in comprehensive interpretation and provides the best treatment in English of Diderot and the Encyclopedists since Lord Morley's classic of 1878.

The Meadville Theological School.

Charles H. Lyttle.

TIMOTHY DWIGHT, 1752-1817. A BIOGRAPHY

By CHARLES E. CUNNINGHAM. New York. The Macmillan Company, 1942. 403 pages. \$3.75.

This reviewer has looked forward to the appearance of a full-length biography of Timothy Dwight for a long time and is very grateful to Mr. Cunningham for this fully documented, careful study. But he is disappointed. His disappointment arises from the fact that the Timothy Dwight that emerges is not the great man which he hoped he would appear. In fact, the following characterization of him by Parrington (Vernon L. Parrington, *The Colonial Mind*, 1620-1800. New York, 1927, 363) has only been confirmed:

A great college president, Timothy Dwight may well have been; he was worshipped by his admirers only this side idolatry; but a great thinker, a steadfast friend of truth in whatever garb it might appear, a generous kindly soul loving even publicans and sinners, regardful of others and forgetful of self, he assuredly was not.

He was endowed with a large fund of shrewd, New England common sense; he had great vigor; he was handsome and impressive in personal appearance; "every inch a college president," as was everywhere recognized; he had literary gift of a rather ponderous sort and "a certain grandiose imagination," but he lacked humor, grace, and creative suggestiveness. He liked majestic effects. This, Parrington points out, is illustrated in his *Conquest of Canaan* where he describes so many thunder storms "that the historian Trumbull suggested he ought to furnish a lightning rod with the poem." This, of course, is primarily a criticism of his literary productions, but nevertheless, one feels that a good share of it may be carried over and made to apply to his career as a whole. My disappointment is in the fact that he was not the great Timothy Dwight I wanted him to be.

I do not mean to imply that Mr. Cunningham's biography has not made a valuable contribution. It has given us the first full view of an important figure in American religious and cultural history. If Timothy Dwight is entitled to be classed as a great figure in any particular sphere, among the many in which he figured, it would be in the realm of the teacher. In his early youth, as a popular instructor at Yale College, he introduced new subjects into the curriculum, and in his private school at Greenfield Hill he likewise blazed new paths, among them being that of offering instruction in the higher branches to women students. He

was among the first to reach the conclusion that the physical and moral sciences could be made as intelligible to the mind of the female as to the male, and that it was time that girls be considered "less as pretty and more as rational, immortal beings" (156). As President of Yale, he likewise blazed new trails in higher education. One was the appointment of Yale's first professor of chemistry, and his sending him to Philadelphia to study under the famous Dr. Joseph Priestley, and later to Edinburgh—an unheard of thing at that time. In fact, it was Timothy Dwight who started the process by which Yale College was transformed into Yale University. It was largely due to Dwight's influence that Yale College became nationally better known than any other American college.

Timothy Dwight, however, has been most widely known as the defender of orthodoxy against the infidel philosophy of the eighteenth century. He succeeded by his sermons in the college chapel and in his teachings in his classroom in transforming the Yale student body from a bunch of sneering shallow rationalists into sincere Christians, and thereby started an influence that was to make Yale the American model of the Christian college throughout the land. In his theology he stressed the duties of Christians, and emphasized the "practical value of the Christian Doctrines" in molding character and supplying the motives and principles for the living of a holy life. It was undoubtedly this emphasis upon the practical that gave Dwight's volumes *Theology: Explained and Defended* such a wide circulation. Indeed, they were more widely read on both sides of the Atlantic, during the first quarter of the 19th century than the writings of any other American theologian, and few since have exercised such a large influence on preaching.

A conservative in politics, Dwight was the great defender of the Connecticut *status quo*. Here he did not want change. Parrington asserts that to him "infidelity and democracy went hand in hand, and to suffer the commonwealth to fall under the control of the godless meant the end of all morality and religion." Such views it is difficult to forgive in one who might have exercised such a wide influence in bringing in a new and better social order. The author has omitted any adequate consideration of Dwight's political views and influence. If Purcell is anywhere near correct (*Connecticut in Transition, 1775-1818*, 319) in stating that Dwight was considered the head of a clerical party; that he was an able politician; that he was an aristocrat and cared little for the poor and the lowly, and that he had a strong aversion to universal suffrage, this reviewer concludes that Mr. Cunningham has overlooked an important phase of Timothy Dwight's career.

The University of Chicago.

William W. Sweet.

THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL IN ENGLAND

By JOHN J. O'CONNOR. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. ix, 102 pages. \$1.00.

"The Roman Catholic Revival in England" would be a more accurate title for this book. It is not concerned with the Catholic revival in

the Church of England except in so far as that supplied converts to Romanism. Apart from this limitation of title the book is a good brief popular presentation of the history of Roman Catholicism in England from the beginnings of the movement for the release of Roman Catholics from civil disabilities to the death of Cardinal Manning (1770-1892). The major portion deals with the work of Wiseman, Newman, and Manning. The author does not hesitate to point out the weaknesses and failures as well as the virtues and successes of these men; nor does he fail to note the dissension within the Roman Catholic Church caused by their activities and the wire-pulling at Rome which sometimes accompanied their efforts and those of their Roman Catholic opponents.

The censor's *Nihil obstat* inevitably makes the reader wonder whether the author ventured to write as he would have done were it not there. For instance, there is the remark on page 78 that in the *Syllabus of Errors* of 1864 Pius IX "condemned only those false and pernicious principles which today have yielded their full measure of totalitarianism, intolerance, war, and death." Was this put in to satisfy the censor while the author's real opinion was expressed some twelve pages before when he said that the *Syllabus* "completely shattered" Wiseman's hope that the Church might "ally herself with most important movements of the century"?

The book is well written, interesting, and commendably free from disparaging references to churches and Christians of other names—a virtue which one wishes were evident in other recent books by Roman Catholic authors, such as Maynard's *Story of American Catholicism*. There is a bibliographical note but no index. The word "offered" in the footnote on page 32 is, presumably, a misprint for "opposed."

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

J. A. Muller.

CARDINAL CONSALVI AND ANGLO-PAPAL RELATIONS, 1814-1824

By JOHN TRACY ELLIS. Washington: Catholic University Press, 1942. xi, 202 pages. \$2.50.

Cardinal Ercole Consalvi among the treaty makers at the Congress of Vienna is a familiar figure. An astute diplomat who could hold his own with Metternich or Talleyrand, he succeeded almost beyond hope in obtaining the virtually complete restoration of the Papal States. A pleasing personality possessed of all the social graces, he won friends for himself and smoothed the way for a better understanding of the political and religious aims of his chief, Pope Pius VII. The same Consalvi negotiating the Concordat of 1801 with Napoleon is less well known. He could meet the alternating bullying and cajolery of the First Consul intrepid and unruffled, and in the end he got what he wanted (though Napoleon like Hitler had little regard for solemn promises). Father Ellis has given us a scholarly study of a Consalvi with whom most historians are barely acquainted, the papal secretary who was very fond of the English.

The "no-popery" tradition was yielding, no doubt, to the curative effects of time. More important, in the immediate past England and the Holy See had a common enemy. England, at a relatively safe distance, had fought doggedly for the overthrow of the French menace to freedom; Pius VII, helpless against brute force, had suffered in his own person for his resistance to tyranny. It was not merely a case of "the enemies of my enemy are my friends." There grew up a certain mutual admiration and sympathy. Some eight thousand French refugee priests thrown on the charity of England also did much to soften old antipathies. Consalvi, the realist statesman saw the possibilities in the changed situation.

His first purpose was to enlist the support of England toward a restoration of lands and of works of art which Revolutionary France had stolen from the pope. His second purpose was to secure a measure of relief for oppressed Catholics in the British Isles. Here, success, which had to come by repeal of the Penal Laws, was slower. Consalvi had other objectives of a humanitarian nature, which were readily shared by leading Englishmen, the abolishing of the slave trade for example. Another project of his was the arranging of a concordat, but this would have aroused too much indignation in England. Consalvi has been likened to his successors, Rampolla, Gaspari, and Pacelli. He reminds us more of Leo XIII with his perpetual smile for his English friends.

This is not, of course, a full-length biography. It gives one, however, a very compact and satisfying picture of an able man and, in the process, brings the reader close to less known phases of a very important historical period. The author undertook his work with the hope of exploring European archives. The outbreak of the war left him a choice between dropping his research and writing his book without that feeling of finality which a few more manuscripts might have given him. He did well to continue with his work. The mass of printed official documents, memoirs, correspondence and other nearly contemporary literature was such as to warrant the hope that little will ever be added or subtracted from the portrait here presented. The text makes easy reading, though there are two or three slips which the proof-reader should have corrected. Strangely, however, what most interested the reviewer were the very copious and valuable foot-notes.

Saint Louis University.

R. Corrigan.

COLERIDGE AND THE BROAD CHURCH MOVEMENT ..

By CHARLES RICHARD SANDERS. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1942. \$3.50.

There were two main groups of Anglican liberals in the nineteenth century. One had Oxford as its center, Copleston, Whately, Arnold, and Jowett as its most conspicuous leaders, and was predominantly Aristotelian. The other was associated with Cambridge, was on the whole Platonic, and had as its main leaders Coleridge, Hare, and Maurice. The aim of Professor Sanders' book, for which the author's previous studies qualify him admirably, is to indicate the nature of the liberalism

which characterized Samuel Taylor Coleridge and the men whom he influenced. Its scope is limited: to indicate the main lines of their religious philosophy. It is in no sense a collection of biographical sketches, a full account of their work or a judgment of their contribution. Its method is maximum quotation and practically no appraisal. To profit most by it the reader should have some knowledge of the career and work of the men studied.

To understand the Coleridgean line of thought is very important, for, in the opinion of this reviewer, Coleridge and Maurice combined that which is of perennial validity in the liberal attitude with a firm hold on those aspects of truth the denial of which caused the current reaction against "Liberalism." Few Anglican writers of the past have as much to teach the present as F. D. Maurice. One is struck increasingly by his points of contact with von Hügel and contemporary Anglo-Catholics who are liberal rather than fundamentalist in temper and governed in their outlook by history rather than simply logic; with those members of the Neo-Orthodox school who look with favor on religious philosophy and the Ecumenical Movement; and with those liberals who place supreme emphasis on the career and teachings of Jesus as the governing factor of all Christian thinking.

There are many things about Professor Sanders' book which deserve praise: the valuable discussion of the nature of Broad Churchmanship in the Introduction; the bibliography, so full that it covers nineteen pages; the discriminating appreciation of Arnold's position after the various recent attempts to discredit him; the portrayal of Julius Charles Hare, vicar of a small country parish, yet one of the most learned scholars of his day, to consult whom people came from Europe and from all over England; the keen analysis of the factors which made Carlyle so antipathetic to Coleridge; the exposition of the relation of these men to Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement; the reminder of the part played in spreading it by laymen like Tennyson and Browning. But by all odds the most important parts of the book are I and III, those which deal with Coleridge and Maurice respectively and which take up nearly two-thirds of the volume. These sections are so arranged as to help a reader interested in tracing their similarities and differences. A chapter on "Some Essentials of Coleridge's Philosophy" is paralleled by a similar one on Maurice; there are discussions of the conservatism and liberalism of each, and of the views of each on the Church. There is also a splendid study of Maurice as a commentator on Coleridge.

Professor Sanders underemphasizes, though he does not ignore, the way in which Maurice labored valiantly to make the Church of England an adequate expression of the Church Universal, namely his attempt to arouse its social conscience and his work in the Christian Socialist Movement. The chief shortcoming of his book is the slighting of this phase of Maurice's thought, for it was a direct outgrowth of his theology, an integral part of his liberalism and one of the most important elements in his influence.

Professor Sanders has put us in debt by this volume. It should serve as a most valuable introduction to the writings of Coleridge

and Maurice and, highest praise of all, it is calculated to arouse a desire to study those writings.

Virginia Theological Seminary,
Alexandria, Va.

A. C. Zabriskie.

THE CHURCH IN THE SOCIAL ORDER

A STUDY OF ANGLICAN SOCIAL THEORY FROM COLERIDGE TO MAURICE

By CYRIL K. GLOYN. Forest Grove, Ore.: Pacific University, 1942. 201 pages. \$1.50.

Since it seems to be the fashion to attach broad, general titles to monographs, it is not surprising to find that this book deals with only a minute portion of its announced subject, but one might expect that the subtitle, at least, would give a reasonably accurate idea of the scope of the work. If, however, it was the author's intention to produce a full account of Anglican social thought in the first half of the nineteenth century, he has failed to achieve his purpose. What he has given us is a series of essays on the social thinking of three individual theologians—Coleridge, Thomas Arnold, and Maurice—and one group of theologians, the Tractarians. The two parties to which most members of the Church of England in that period belonged are ignored except for a few incidental references. The Evangelicals may, as Mr. Gloyn says, have had "social but little intellectual significance." The older High Churchmen may too often have shared the attitude of Archdeacon Grantly, to whom, "The church was beautiful . . . because one man by interest might have a thousand a year, while another man equally good, but without interest, could only have a hundred." Nevertheless, taken together, these two groups formed the main body of Anglicanism, from which the writers studied were, in one way or another, divergent.

This mislabeling is unfortunate, because, taken for what it is, a series of special studies, the book is both useful and timely. Mr. Gloyn has done careful research on all his subjects and he interprets their thought clearly and intelligently. By calling attention to them he shows how far back the Anglican tradition of liberal social thinking goes, and thereby helps to explain to persons unfamiliar with the Church of England how a religious body popularly regarded as the embodiment of conservatism could produce such a forward-looking document as the *Malvern Manifesto*. The article on the Tractarians was especially interesting to the present reviewer as showing the presence of active social interests in a group generally supposed to have been exclusively preoccupied with questions of theology and polity. It is to be wished that an essay on Kingsley might have been added to the collection, for his reputation as a social reformer seems to be rising as his standing as a novelist declines. Mr. Gloyn explains the omission by saying that, though Kingsley was the spokesman for the Christian Socialist movement, "Maurice was its theoretician and formulated its social philosophy."

Lynbrook, N. Y.

William Wilson Manross.

WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH

By DORES ROBINSON SHARPE. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. 463 pages. \$2.75.

It is undoubtedly a happy circumstance that so significant a work as Charles Howard Hopkins's *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism* should be followed within a period of two years by the official biography of Walter Rauschenbusch, the American scholar of German lineage who formulated a theology for the social gospel. These two books belong together and should be read together.

Walter Rauschenbusch, teacher, author, and evangelist, was the product of a significant era in the history of Western civilization. By training as well as by inheritance he was a German-American, a fact which caused him embarrassment and no slight mental suffering after the outbreak of the first World War. But of Rauschenbusch's essential Americanism there can be little doubt; and it was America that gave him his career. In his younger years he witnessed the social dislocation and the misery that moved in the train of the great American economic revolution of the post-Civil War years, and he was deeply affected by the same forces that aroused men such as Henry George, Edward Bellamy, Henry D. Lloyd, Washington Gladden, and others. In the decades of the 1880's and 1890's—the years that brought forth Andrew Carnegie's *Triumphant Democracy* on the one hand and labor upheavals, Populism, and many "literary protests" on the other hand—Rauschenbusch's social philosophy was taking form. He was carried along by the mounting tide of protest which, after the turn of the century, thanks in no small part to the labors of the muckrakers, took on the proportions of a nationwide "crusade for social justice." The social legislation of the era of "progressivism" is, of course, a matter of common knowledge; less well known, however, is the fact that the social climate in which the Progressive movement grew so lustily was the same social climate in which also the social gospel movement acquired its vigor. The crusade for social justice in America was a broad stream of many currents. In this significant era there were some reformers who followed Theodore Roosevelt or Woodrow Wilson, and there were others, who like Walter Rauschenbusch, became Christian Socialists.

Walter Rauschenbusch was doubtless the greatest of the propagandists of the movement to Christianize the social order. In a sense he was a muckraker; but he was more than that; he was an able social philosopher and the originator of a theology for the social gospel. He can not be considered a pioneer in the social gospel movement; he was rather a beneficiary of the labors of the pioneers of social reform. Henry George, Washington Gladden, Richard T. Ely, Josiah Strong, and others of their generation were his teachers, and they helped to prepare the mind of America to accept his social teaching. To the task of social enlightenment to which he set himself Rauschenbusch brought a sound scholarship, a deep understanding of the plight of the submerged classes, and a power of expression that made his first important book, *Christianity*

and the *Social Crisis*, which appeared in 1907, a book of the hour. From that time onward until his untimely death in 1918, the professor of church history in the Rochester Theological Seminary was a leader of distinction. His influence extended far beyond the borders of his own country.

Mr. Sharpe sat under the instruction of Rauschenbusch and later he served his teacher as confidential secretary. He therefore knew Rauschenbusch intimately and he admired him immensely. But the life he has written of his teacher is no Boswellian exercise in hero worship. On the contrary, it represents an honest and, on the whole, a successful attempt to appraise justly the career of a many-sided man. Mr. Sharpe had free access to the private papers of Rauschenbusch, and he made full use of his sources. His decision to quote copiously from the writings of Rauschenbusch—some of which are not easily accessible—is to be commended. In some respects he has produced a source book. Unfortunately, he did not append to his book a bibliography of Rauschenbusch—an omission many persons will deeply regret. Even Mr. Hopkins's promised *Bibliography of Social Christianity* can scarcely be expected to compensate for this oversight.

Although Mr. Sharpe has concerned himself with the entire career of Rauschenbusch, it is quite evident that his major concern has been to present his former teacher as a prophet—a "modern Amos." Accordingly he has given much attention to the development of the social philosophy of Rauschenbusch and has analyzed Rauschenbusch's principal writings. Of these writings he characterizes *Christianizing the Social Order*, a book which appeared in 1912, as "the most profound and, intellectually, the finest wrought of any of his writings"; and in this judgment the reviewer is disposed to concur. But Mr. Sharpe observes that some persons—and Mr. Hopkins is one of them—incline to the belief that *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (1917) is Rauschenbusch's greatest book.

If we agree with Mr. Sharpe that the social creed of the American Protestant churches "was the flowering of the Rauschenbusch philosophy," and if we accept his further assertion that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is the "lengthened shadow" of Rauschenbusch, we shall not cease to wonder why it is that Rauschenbusch is not more widely known in this generation. Judging by the books they produce, most of the authors of the general textbooks of American history for college students know nothing of him. *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, to be sure, does receive brief mention in H. B. Parkes's *Recent America* (1941). But so well informed a scholar as Arthur M. Schlesinger has not included any of Rauschenbusch's writings in the bibliography which accompanies his *Political and Social Growth of the American People*. Nor does the name of Rauschenbusch appear in the text of Harold Underwood Faulkner's *The Quest for Social Justice*, although Faulkner has atoned somewhat for this neglect by recognizing in the bibliographical essay that accompanies this volume the fact that *Christianity and the Social Crisis* and *Christianizing the Social Order* perhaps influenced the younger clergy of the era to which these writings belong more than any other books of that character. On the other hand, the names of Washington Gladden and Josiah Strong are fairly well known and are frequently mentioned in connection with the rise of the social gospel. Here, indeed, is

a curious state of affairs. Perhaps Mr. Sharpe's book will serve the useful purpose of re-introducing Rauschenbusch to Americans.

Bucknell University

J. Orin Oliphant.

AN APPRAISAL OF THE PROTOCOLS OF ZION

By JOHN S. CURTISS. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.
xii, 118 pages. \$1.00.

"The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" appeared some thirty years ago and since then have been translated into many languages and spread far and wide in many lands. The burden of their tale is that a Jewish conspiracy exists to undermine civilization and take control of the nations of the world. Disproved and ridiculed again and again in writing and before courts of law, the Protocols continued to appear and to stir the credulous, serving as an important weapon in the arsenal of the anti-democratic and pro-fascist forces. It is hard to tell which is the more remarkable, the cynicism with which the fantastic forgery has been propagated or the willingness of so many millions to believe it.

The book under review represents an attempt to analyze the Protocols dispassionately. Dr. Curtiss applies to the material the strict rules of historical research. After telling the history of the document, he presents the "proof" which the "discoverers" of the Protocols produced in favor of their authenticity. Their evidence is found to be contradictory at every crucial point and, in some instances, their facts and dates do not agree. An appendix sets forth a number of important passages in parallel columns with excerpts from Maurice Joly's satire on Napoleon III which quite obviously served as the source of the Protocols. A useful bibliography lists the more important books and articles in which the Protocols have been attacked and defended.

The volume was published under the auspices and sponsorship of a group of distinguished Christian historians. The author, too, is a Christian. If it is disheartening that scholars should have to testify against so obvious a lie, one must be grateful to them for having come forward to the defense of truth.

Gratz College,
Philadelphia, Penna.

Solomon Grayzel.

FRANK S. BREWER PRIZE CONTEST

The American Society of Church History announces that a contest will be held in 1943 for the award of the Frank S. Brewer Prize. Studies in any part of church history will be submitted to a jury appointed by the Society and the award will be made by this group. The prize consists approximately of the sum of \$500, to be used toward the publication of the prize essay in the Society's series of *Studies in Church History*.

Essays, which should be in finished form, must be submitted to the Secretary of the Society at his address, 520 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa., by June 1, 1943. The award will be made by October 1, 1943.

THOMAS CLINTON PEARS, JR.,
Secretary.

**AMERICAN CONTACTS
WITH THE EASTERN
CHURCHES 1820-1870**

By P. E. Shaw, \$2.00

A history of the Greek Mission of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Episcopal Mission to Constantinople, the work of the A. B. C. F. M. in Turkey and Greece and a history of the indigenous Greek Evangelical Church by an author well-qualified to write on the subject. Most timely in view of the present interest in ecumenical Christianity.

**CONGREGATIONALISM
IN THE DUTCH
NETHERLANDS**

By Raymond P. Stearns, \$2.00

The author presents hitherto unpublished documents relating to the English Congregationalists in Holland. New light on the history of Congregationalism.

**EPISCOPAL
APPOINTMENTS
IN THE REIGN
OF EDWARD II**

By W. E. L. Smith, \$1.50

An exhaustive study based almost entirely upon original material, and filling a need which has not been met hitherto by any other work.

**THE GREAT AWAKENING
IN NOVA SCOTIA
1776-1809**

By Maurice W. Armstrong, \$2.00

An original study of the extension of the Colonial Great Awakening into Nova Scotia, with particular emphasis upon the life and work of Henry Alline. Other important leaders are given consideration as well.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

All who order a copy of Maurice W. Armstrong's
The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia
are offered a 50% discount on the other three
previously published books advertised on this page.

These prices (postage additional) are valid only
on direct orders from

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

55 Elizabeth Street
Hartford 5, Conn.